

# MODERN PHILOLOGY

VOLUME XXV

*May 1928*

NUMBER 4

## THE ORIGIN OF THE DIALECTAL DIFFERENCES IN SPOKEN AMERICAN ENGLISH

The publication of J. S. Kenyon's *American Pronunciation* in 1924 and of G. P. Krapp's *The English Language in America* in 1925 bears witness to a new interest in spoken American English and its history. In the period intervening between these recent books and the nineties, when Grandgent, Sheldon, Emerson, and Hempl were engaged in ascertaining usage in the various parts of this country, both by personal observation and by carefully prepared questions submitted to competent observers, the pronunciation of English in America received little attention. Even less thought was given to the history of our pronunciation, to which these scholars had also devoted themselves, without, however, pushing their studies very far. As a result we are today not much better informed on these questions than thirty years ago, although W. Read's recent papers on southern pronunciation<sup>1</sup> have materially increased our knowledge of that area.

And yet, a thorough survey of actual usage in the various sections of the country is as necessary to the historical study of our pronunciation as for the question of a standard of pronunciation. Until we shall possess such a survey, all historical investigation must proceed largely by "safe guesses," and all arguments for a standard will be swayed by local or personal preference.

In undertaking a discussion of the origin of our regional differences in pronunciation I am not unaware of the fact that pitfalls must lie hidden in this scantily explored field, and I fully realize that my views are of a tentative nature.

<sup>1</sup> "The Vowel System of the United States," *Englische Studien*, XLI, 70 ff.; "Some Phases of American Pronunciation," *JEGP*, XXII, 217 ff.

## I

It is generally assumed—if one may judge by the statements that appeared in print before the publication of Krapp's work<sup>1</sup>—that American English, apparently also in its spoken form, is essentially the Southern English Standard of the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries as modified locally in the course of the last century or two. This is the view advanced by Whitney, presumably for American English as a whole;<sup>2</sup> by Ellis, for "the eastern United States, New York and Massachusetts";<sup>3</sup> accepted by Emerson for the speech of Ithaca, New York;<sup>4</sup> and defended by Sheldon.<sup>5</sup> That such retardation of change in languages cut off from their mother-country does take place nobody can doubt who knows of the history of Icelandic; and that American English preserves words, phrases, constructions, as well as articulations of the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries, that were lost in the Southern English Standard is no less evident. Among the retarded sounds one might mention the vowel in *cut*, which has been lowered to low-central position in Southern English, but is still pronounced with considerable elevation of the back of the tongue in America; the first consonant in *wheat* [wɪ:t], which with us is still generally pronounced as a voiceless labial fricative followed by a voiced glide (except in parts of the South; elsewhere rather commonly

<sup>1</sup> See the present writer's review in *Language*, III, 131-39.

<sup>2</sup> W. D. Whitney, *Language and the Study of Language* (1868), pp. 171 ff.

<sup>3</sup> A. J. Ellis, *Early English Pronunciation*, V, 236.

<sup>4</sup> O. F. Emerson, "The Ithaca Dialect," *Dialect Notes*, I, 169-73. Emerson's stand is not altogether clear to me. In the following passage, written in 1891, he seems to assume a common source for all American varieties of educated speech: "The present resemblance of American English to standard English, and especially to that of the last century, appears to indicate that an English dialect with close resemblance to standard English is the predecessor of Ithaca Dialect" (p. 169). The statement in his *History of the English Language*, p. 109, does not define that source. It reads as follows: "Spoken English thruout America is more uniform among all classes, there being no such strongly marked dialects as in England. This is no doubt accounted for by the fact that the language originated in the middle class of English society, and that since its transplantation to America, it has not had time to break up into widely diverse dialects." But the author probably has in mind the Southern English Standard.

<sup>5</sup> F. S. Sheldon, "What Is a Dialect?" *Dialect Notes*, I, 293. Sheldon does not, however, deny a dialect basis outright. Says he: "... The historic continuity of our dialect variations with those of England has been, to say the least, much interfered with, and, apart from certain isolated communities which may, it is quite possible, exist, it may perhaps be said that the basis of all our American English, local varieties included, is standard English, or, which is saying nearly the same thing, those English dialects which are or were at the time of the English colonization almost identical with the standard English have been the main source of popular speech."

in unstressed *whenever*, *whatever*, *wherever*, and the exclamatory *why!*,<sup>1</sup> while it became fully voiced in Southern English;<sup>2</sup> the vowel in *get*, which still has a more open pronunciation with us than in Southern English. All of these sounds are common to all of the United States, although the seaboard of New England is somewhat closer to Southern English.

But not all the deviations of American educated pronunciation from the Southern English Standard can be explained as owing to the conservation of an earlier stage of that Standard, and even the retarded sounds just mentioned can without exception be derived from the Northern English pronunciation of the Southern Standard. To my mind, most of the dialectal differences existing at present between New England, the South, and the North-and-West did not develop out of a uniform Southern English Standard, but have their bases partly in the regional varieties of the Standard and partly in the strongly dialectal speech which the earlier settlers of these regions brought with them from England and Scotland. This conclusion seems to me unavoidable to one tracing the treatment of the *r*, and the vowels preceding an original *r* in the three sections mentioned.

The New Englanders, except those in the northwestern section, and the southerners, especially those on the Atlantic Coast and in the lower South, pronounce the *r* only before vowels, as in *ready*, *hurry*, *far off* (and even in that position it is frequently slighted before an unstressed vowel, as in *carry*, *Maryland* [kæ(ə)l, mæələnd]); they have no *r*-sound before consonants and finally, as in *large*, *heard*, *fair*, *far cry* [lɑ:dʒ, hɜ:d, fɛə, fɑ:kraɪ]. With a considerable minority in the upper South, the tip of the tongue does rise more or less toward the *r*-position in the latter cases (especially in the vowel of *heard*, rarely after the low vowels of *large* and *order*), but not far enough to produce a distinct *r*-sound; the impression on the ear is rather that of a muffled vowel.<sup>3</sup>

In the rest of the United States, holding two-thirds of the entire population, the *r* is pronounced in all positions. Before vowels it is a

<sup>1</sup> G. Hempl, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, VI, 310-11; and C. H. Grandgent, *ibid.*, VIII, 277. But S. Primer (*Phon. Stud.*, I, 239) claims that in Charleston, S.C., "in the combination *wh* the *h* is always silent."

<sup>2</sup> D. Jones, *An Outline of English Phonetics* (2d ed.), p. 65.

<sup>3</sup> Grandgent, *op. cit.*, VII, 276.

voiced fricative formed by narrowing the air-passage at the upper gums with the front edge of the tongue, or even in the region of the palate by tilting it back, as in parts of the Middle West. Before consonants and in final position the tongue is somewhat lower and the *r* has here a more vocalic ring. The former short high-front vowel [ɪ] and the short mid-vowels [ɛ, ʌ, ə] have been encroached upon by the *r* to such an extent that they have entirely disappeared.<sup>1</sup> In words like *first*, *fern*, *fur*, a long strong vocalic *r* follows immediately upon the initial consonant. The short of this *r* is heard in the unstressed syllable of *father*.

Adherents of the principle of conservatism should find it hard to reconcile these facts to their theory. For the preconsonantal and final *r* should in that case be preserved, if anywhere (see p. 391, n. 2), in the oldest colonies: eastern Massachusetts, where only the recently immigrated Irish have this *r*, and the tide-water region of Virginia, where it is wholly unknown. The suggestion that the closer personal relations of the maritime colonies with England caused the loss of the *r* in these sections does not bear scrutiny. There is no indication that this peculiarity was confined to the small group that studied and traveled in England and to the rather small groups whose pronunciation they could influence. This *r* was lost by all, as far as we know; by the large rural population as well as by the inhabitants of the few cities. Nor is Sheldon's view that this *r* was reintroduced "in some parts of the country, particularly Ohio and vicinity," as a spelling pronunciation or as an analogical extension of the double pronunciation of words with final *r* (like that of *hear* in *hear it* [hɪərɪt] and in *hear them* [hɪərðəm], respectively) at all probable.<sup>2</sup>

Grandgent<sup>3</sup> inclines to the belief "that the school-master, the spelling-book, and the dictionary, whose authority is wellnigh absolute in sparsely settled and comparatively uncultivated communities, have been largely responsible for the prevalence of *r* in the North and

<sup>1</sup> R. M. Pierce, *Dictionary of Hard Words* (New York, 1910); G. P. Krapp, *The English Language in America*, II, 167; and H. E. Palmer, *A Dictionary of English Pronunciation with American Variants* (New York, 1927), regularly write a vowel before the *r*, but I have heard that pronunciation only from Scotchmen and Irishmen.

<sup>2</sup> An opinion expressed in the 1892 meeting of the Dialect Society, and reported in *Dialect Notes*, I, 173.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, VII, 275. Both the speech of the home and that of the school have a share in forming the speech-habits of the child. But if the speech of the schoolmaster (or his school pronunciation) is at variance with that of the majority of the homes of the community his influence can be but slight.



West." But he also hesitatingly concedes that "perhaps, the influence of the Scotch and Irish immigrants has made itself felt" on this point.

In my opinion, the dialectal basis is the primary factor in the treatment of the *r*. On this point the kinship of the speech of Eastern New England and the pronunciation of Standard English in the south of England is obvious, and no less so the similarity of the speech of our North-and-West and the pronunciation of Standard English in the north of England as described by R. J. Lloyd.<sup>1</sup>

Such parallelism in the treatment of only one sound, which, to be sure, entails an extensive modification of all vowels preceding it,<sup>2</sup> would in itself be no proof of common origin. But there are other points of similarity and resemblance between the two pairs.

In our North-and-West the vowels represented in *made* and *mode* are only slightly diphthongal, the upglide of the tongue never passing beyond the mid-region, and the same seems to be the case in Northern English.<sup>3</sup> In eastern New England and Virginia, however, the upglide is much longer, the tongue passing into high position, especially when these sounds are at the end of a phrase, as in *Is he leaving today?* [tədeɪ] and in *That is not so!* [səʊ], following the tendency that has produced the strongly diphthongal vowels in Southern English.<sup>4</sup>

Agreement between our North-and-West<sup>5</sup> and the English North is also found on the following points: (a) the preservation of the distinction between the mid-open long vowel [ɔ:] of *four*, *hoarse*, *mourning*, and the low short [ɒ] of *forty*, *horse*, *morning* (see Kenyon, *Am. Pron.*, p. 120); (b) the qualitatively identical vowels in *hat* and in *half*; (c) perhaps also a preference for the voiceless *s*-sound in *transition*, *discern*, and *greasy*, etc.;<sup>6</sup> (d) the peculiar monotonous intonation

<sup>1</sup> *Northern English* (2d ed., 1908), pars. 100-103 and 113.

<sup>2</sup> In general, the varieties of English in which the post-vocalic and the final *r* are lost have more open vowels, as in *more*, *fair* [mɔː, fɛː], and also in *poor*, *here*; but in our South these vowels are even closer than in the *r*-pronouncing North (see W. Read, *JEGP*, XXII, 220 ff.).

<sup>3</sup> R. Lloyd, *op. cit.*, pars. 89 and 94.

<sup>4</sup> S. Primer, "Charleston Provincialisms," *Phon. Stud.*, I, 232, claims for Charleston, S.C., that "the long (e) is equivalent to (ee'j)," i.e. [e:j]. But H. R. Lang, *Phon. Stud.*, II, 185, objects to this observation, saying that *no* and *may* have [o:] and [e:], respectively. For the history of these "slow" diphthongs see Jespersen, *Mod. Engl. Gram.*, Vol. I, sec. 11.4.

<sup>5</sup> The North-and-West extends westward from the Hudson River, in some respects even from the Connecticut River, and southward to the Potomac and the Ohio, although southern traits are found for a considerable distance to the north of these rivers.

<sup>6</sup> G. Hempl, *Dialect Notes*, I, 438; and R. Lloyd, *op. cit.*, par. 140. Hempl gives a different interpretation of the facts (p. 443).

of the sentence. G. P. Krapp's statement in his *English Language in America*, II, 23, that "in this matter of cadences, it is quite obvious to one familiar with various types of British speech, that the cadences of speech in the north of England are on the whole much closer to those of American speech than are the cadences of the speech of the south of England," certainly does not apply to the speech of New England and our South.

On the other hand, the speech of seaboard New England agrees with, or resembles, that of the south of England in the following respects: (a) The vowel of *hot*, *lock*, and *stop* has lip-rounding, which, to be sure, is not as pronounced in New England as in the south of England. (b) The vowel of *four* and *mourning* is lowered to the level of the vowel in *all* and identical in quality with the vowel of *forty* and *morning*, less widely in New England than in the South of England; in turn, the vowel of *all* is closer in these two varieties of English than in the other two. (c) The preference for the high unstressed vowel [ɪ] in *darkness*, *houses*, *wicked*. (d) The shortened vowel of *coat*, *whole*, and *home* is recorded for East Anglia (Norfolk) (see Ellis, *Early English Pronunciation*, pp. 1211 ff.). (e) The palatalization of the velar stops of *garden* and *cow* in New England (and the South), now considered vulgar and passing out of use, has its parallel in Southern English dialects.<sup>1</sup> (f) Although the low-central vowel in New England *half*, *dance* [ha:f, da:ns], and the low-back vowel in the Southern English pronunciation of these words did not become fashionable before the eighties of the eighteenth century, it is probable that the new sounds are the result of a common preliminary step, namely, the lengthening of the older [æ] before fricatives and the nasal dental consonant groups. (g) Certain phases of intonation.

When these resemblances between the several groups are considered together, the case for the dialectal bases becomes a strong one.

<sup>1</sup> Grandgent, *op. cit.*, VI, 458-59, and *Old and New* (1920), pp. 127-28. In the earlier article he writes in part: "I am told, however, that it is still prevalent in eastern Virginia [i.e., in 1891]."

S. Primer, "The Pronunciation of Fredericksburg, Va.," *PMLA*, V, 199, says: "This pronunciation is of course not general. Some consider it vulgar and avoid it, but it can be heard in the best families [i.e., in 1890]." And in *Phon. Stud.*, I, 240, he claims that it is heard in Virginia, South Carolina, Boston, and Cambridge, and adds that there is "no doubt that it is an individual peculiarity all over the country. Here [Charleston, S.C.] it is the prevailing pronunciation." Geographically, the statement seems rather too sweeping, but forty years ago this pronunciation was certainly much more common than now.

## II

Fortunately, the linguistic evidence for a historical connection between American speech of the North-and-West and that of Northern England, on the one hand, and between the speech of eastern New England (and, in part, that of our South) and the pronunciation of the south of England, on the other, is well supported by the history of American colonization, of the westward movement, and of later immigration.

Before the Irish immigration, which began about 1840, the population of the seaboard of New England had come for the most part from the southeastern counties of England (especially in the earlier period),<sup>1</sup> the home of the Southern English Standard. It is not surprising then that the speech of the seaboard of New England should resemble that Standard in its treatment of the *r* and the other points mentioned. The settlers simply brought with them the speech-habits of their native counties. The earliest of them probably pronounced a weak *r* before consonants and, finally, the later ones not;<sup>2</sup> and even the earliest of them possessed the Southern English tendency to diphthongize the close mid and high vowels.<sup>3</sup>

Western New England, however, received a considerable admixture of Scotch-Irish in the half-century preceding the Revolution,<sup>4</sup> and is therefore in certain respects "Western" in speech. It is the speech of the west of New England that became established in New York State and in the Western Reserve of Ohio.

Like the seaboard of New England, the tide-water region of Virginia received most of its early population from Southeastern England,

<sup>1</sup> E. Channing, *The United States of America (1765-1865)*, pp. 1-2.

<sup>2</sup> H. C. Wyld, *History of Modern Colloquial English*, pp. 298-99. O. F. Emerson's view on the history of the *r* in New York State, which is based on the older chronology, can no longer be maintained. Says he (*Dialect Notes*, I, 173): "... As the loss of *r* in standard English and in Eastern [according to Ellis] occurred in this [the nineteenth] century, according to Ellis and Sweet, cerebral *r* may be more naturally accounted for as a survival in the Ithaca Dialect than as the influence of another English dialect."

G. P. Krapp gives examples of unintentionally phonetic spellings in the New England town records of the latter part of the seventeenth century which are unmistakable evidence that the post-vocalic *r* had been lost by that time, at least with some persons (see *The English Language in America*, II, 229).

<sup>3</sup> Recent investigators have brought forward evidence to show that the Southern English tendency to diphthongal articulation of long vowels was already active in the seventeenth century (Jespersen, *op. cit.*, I, 325 ff.).

<sup>4</sup> H. J. Ford, *The Scotch-Irish in America*, pp. 225 ff.; F. J. Turner, *The Frontier in American History*, p. 71.

and therefore has Southern English speech habits. But the Piedmont of Virginia and the Carolinas, and the Great Valley, were largely settled, during the half-century preceding the Revolution, by the Scotch-Irish, who spoke a quite different dialect, namely, the English of the Lowlands of Scotland or the north of England as modified by the Southern English Standard.<sup>1</sup> They neither dropped their *r*'s nor did they pronounce their long mid-vowels diphthongal fashion. The large German element from Pennsylvania ultimately acquired this type of English.

In the Old Southwest these two stocks became intimately mixed, the Scotch-Irish element being, however, much larger in the northern part. For Kentucky, Tennessee, as well as the southern portions of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, and much of Missouri received most of their early population from the Valley of Virginia and the Piedmont, where the Scotch-Irish predominated; while the Cotton Belt of western Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and eastern Tennessee was settled very largely by the cotton-growers of the tide-water of Virginia and the Carolinas.<sup>2</sup> The differences in the speech of the two elements were in part leveled out. The Scotch-Irish softened their trilled *r*'s to the present more or less pronounced inversion of the tip of the tongue; the tide-water emigrants gave up their pronounced diphthongization of the long mid-vowels and some other peculiarities. But many purely dialectal articulations remain in the South, especially in secluded mountain districts and among the negroes.

The population of the Middle Atlantic states was mixed. The religious tolerance of the Quakers attracted immigrants from all parts of the British Isles and of Western Europe. Although we have little definite information regarding the exact provenience of the Quakers themselves, it is nevertheless clear that a considerable majority of the population of the Middle Colonies did not have Southern English speech habits. It is estimated that at the time of the Revolution the population of this region was one-third Quaker, one-third Scotch-Irish, and one-third German.<sup>3</sup> Of these elements the Scotch-Irish certainly did not speak in the manner of the south of England; and, as

<sup>1</sup> H. J. Ford, *op. cit.*, pp. 90 ff. and 378 ff.

<sup>2</sup> W. E. Dodd, *The Cotton Kingdom*, pp. 9 ff.

<sup>3</sup> "In 1774 Benjamin Franklin computed the proportion [of Scotch-Irish in Pennsylvania] as one-third in a total of 350,000" (Ford, *op. cit.*, p. 265).

regards the Quakers, the fact that this religious movement was organized in the north of England and the northern Midlands (1644-54) and found its most numerous and most fervent adherents and apostles in these sections and the west of England,<sup>1</sup> i.e., outside the area in which the Standard arose and was most widely accepted,<sup>2</sup> would seem to warrant the inference that a good portion of them came from those regions. That very many of them knew spoken Southern English intimately is more than doubtful, as nearly all of them belonged to the middle class and had not been at the southern universities or in intimate contact with the nobility. They might use the vocabulary and the idiom of the Southern English Standard, as their leaders undoubtedly did;<sup>3</sup> but their pronunciation must have had considerable local color, at least as much as the educated speech of the north and the west of England has at the present time (except for those that receive their education in the schools of Southeastern England). Besides, their natural Northern or Western English speech-habits would be encouraged in contact with the Scotch. The Scotch, in turn, probably reduced their trilled *r* [r] to the fricative *r* [ɹ] in contact with the Quakers. The German element eventually adopted the resulting local pronunciation of English.

Thus the English of the Middle states was probably not very uniform, but it had as a general feature the strong *r* in all positions, the only slightly diphthongal long mid-vowels, and the other peculiarities enumerated above for our present North-and-West. This form of speech was carried westward and triumphantly crossed the continent, being reinforced in various points by the speech of the Irish, who came in imposing numbers from 1840 onward.<sup>4</sup> The non-English immi-

<sup>1</sup> The influence of the speech of the west of England on American English is hard to discern. Krapp points out a number of rather doubtful cases of such an influence in his *English Language in America*, II, 121, 125, 142.

<sup>2</sup> W. C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (1912), pp. 127, 130, 153, 164-65, 375, 381-83; *The Second Period of Quakerism* (1919), pp. 408-9.

<sup>3</sup> Despite the remoteness of the dignified style of the King James Version (1611) of the Bible, it must have influenced the colloquial language of the Bible-reading Quakers a great deal, thus eliminating dialect words, idioms, and grammatical forms.

<sup>4</sup> For the history of the westward movement consult F. C. Turner, *The Rise of the New West* (1907), pp. 28-44; and his *Frontier in American History* (1920), pp. 27-28, 164, 215-16, and esp. 223-24. Turner gives proper weight to the importance of the middle region in the westward movement, while most of the older historians were inclined to slight that section in favor of New England and the South. For the Quaker migrations see R. M. Jones, *The Later Periods of Quakerism*, I, 377 ff., and II, 840 ff. Interesting statistics are given by L. K. Mathews, *The Expansion of New England* (1908), p. 200. Consult also Channing, *History of the United States*, IV, chap. ix, and V, 40, 48, 50, 61, 220 ff.

grants favored the *r* and non-diphthongal vowels, but their influence probably counted for little.

The New Englanders of the seaboard who migrated westward to western New England, New York State, the Western Reserve of Ohio, and the Farther West—first through Pennsylvania or the Shenandoah Valley and Kentucky, and, after the opening of the Erie Canal, by the new route—were sooner or later assimilated in speech to the locally prevalent type. They acquired the post-vocalic *r*, restrained their inclination to diphthongize the close mid-vowels, and gave up the "Italian *a*" [a:] in *half*, *pass*, *dance*, etc., and the short vowel in *stone*, *whole*, etc.<sup>1</sup>

#### SUMMARY

The dialectal differences in the pronunciation of educated Americans from various sections of the country have their origin largely in the British regional differences in the pronunciation of Standard English.

The seaboard of New England, drawing for two centuries most of its population from Southeastern England, is in speech akin to the counties whose speech contributed most to the Southern English Standard of pronunciation. But the recent Irish influx has undermined the earlier uniformity.<sup>2</sup>

The South is divided and uneven in speech. Tide-water Virginia is strongly Southern English in speech, the Piedmont and the mountain country of the Atlantic states strongly Scotch, Georgia and the Old Southwest mixed of the two in stock and speech—the latter type predominating in the upper South, the former in the lower South. Besides, there are in this section of the country numerous secluded communities of pronounced dialectal speech.

<sup>1</sup> In an interesting letter in *Dialect Notes*, I, 17, written in 1889, P. Seymour, of Hudson, Ohio, says: "Most men are gone who brought from Connecticut the pronunciation of *stone*, *coat* with the short *o*; and from New Hampshire of *bone* with the same short *o* . . . and from Massachusetts (I think), *hoarse* and *coarse* pronounced very nearly like *horse* and *course*."

<sup>2</sup> G. Hempl, *Dialect Notes*, II, 254, put it this way: "However unwilling some New Englanders may be to acknowledge it, the present large immigration of peoples from other parts of the English-speaking world is introducing in New England a more general form of English; and that the Irish have a part in this movement, there can be no doubt. This may be observed in the matter of pronunciation as well as in that of vocabulary."

See also Grandgent's observation, *Old and New*, p. 139, that "the 'Italian *a*' is most constant among farmers, less stable among city people, whose convictions have been shaken by contact with the Irish and also by the school teacher, who has often insisted on a compromise vowel."



The North-and-West has, at all events, a Northern English (including Lowland Scotch) basis in stock and speech. This section is surprisingly uniform in speech over its entire vast area, the speech of the seaboard New Englanders having been assimilated to the "West-ern" type.

All of the three types of spoken American English are conservative as compared with the pronunciation of the Southern English Standard in the Southeast and the southern Midlands of England. But what they conserve is not the various stages of that Standard, as seems to have been so generally assumed, but certain features—phonetic as well as lexical—of the several basic British regional varieties of Standard English.<sup>1</sup>

HANS KURATH

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY  
COLUMBUS, OHIO

<sup>1</sup> One of the serious faults of the older view (which is not shared by Krapp) is due to the assumption that *all* of England had a uniform spoken standard during the first century and a half of American colonization, as it undoubtedly had a written standard. That was certainly not the case. The spreading of the Southern English Standard Pronunciation into the north of England and the rest of the British Isles did not make much headway, even among the better educated, until the latter part of the eighteenth century—the time of our Revolution, when the growing desire for a nation-wide spoken standard found expression in the publication of the first pronouncing dictionaries: John Walker, *A General Idea of a Pronouncing Dictionary of the English Language* (1774), and *A Critical Pronouncing Dictionary and Expositor of the English Language* (1791); Thomas Sheridan, *A General Dictionary of the English Language* (1780). Walker (3d ed., stereotyped; New York, 1827) makes the significant statement that "those at a considerable distance from the capitol do not only mispronounce many words taken separately, but they scarcely pronounce with purity a single word, syllable, or letter. . . . The best educated people in the provinces, if constantly resident there, are sure to be strongly tinctured with the dialect of the country in which they live." And even today the north of England (including the northern Midlands), the Lowlands of Scotland, the west of England, and Ireland have their local versions of the spoken standard.



## ALLITERATION IN THE RUNIC INSCRIPTIONS

Of a large number of old Norse runic inscriptions which have been discovered and interpreted<sup>1</sup> only a few have any connection with the problem of alliteration. These are as follows:

- I. By stone, Norway, seventh century, Noreen. 7<sup>2</sup>  
ek irilaR hroRaR hroReR orte þat aRina ubt alaifu dagaR runoR  
markiþe<sup>3</sup>  
I earl Hrör, Hrör's son, made this mound in memory of Alof.  
Dagr engraved the runes.
- II. Bō stone, Norway, sixth Century, Noreen, 8  
hhabudas hlaiwa  
Hnofoþ's grave
- III. Darum bracteate, iii, Denmark, fifth century, Noreen, 13  
liliR aiwuida it uha  
Lillr [owns this]. Oe fashioned it.
- IV. Eggjum stone slab, Norway, ca. 700, Johannesson, 14  
hin warb naseu manR made þaim kaiba i bormuþa huni huwaR  
ob kam haris a hi a lant gotna fiskR oRuki nauim suemande folkl  
if sliti na galande is alin misurki ni s solu sot uk ni sakse stain  
skorinn ni sati manR nakda ni snareR ni witiR manR lagi hin  
la . . . . .  
Over this stone the man poured blood and with it scraped the  
planks of the sledge when the work of the auger was done. Which  
of the multitude of runes has come hither, hither into the land of  
men? To the fish swimming through the stream of corpses [=ON  
-ormr], to the bird which would screech if it could rend the dead  
[=ON -are, i.e., Ormare to Ormar], an avenger is born. The stone  
has not been exposed to the rays of the sun, nor have the runes  
been cut with a knife. Let no one lift up the stone to expose it,  
nor shall bold or foolish persons lay it down.
- V. Etelheim clasp, Sweden, end of fifth century, Noreen, 18  
mik marila wortā  
Mærle made me.
- VI. Flistad stone, Sweden, eighth century, Noreen, 19  
gamR atR glanta  
Gammr to Glenta

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. Noreen, *Altlandische Grammatik* (4te Aufl.; Halle, 1923), pp. 374 ff.

<sup>2</sup> The Arable numerals refer throughout to Noreen, *op. cit.*, or to A. Johannesson, *Grammatik der Urnordischen Runeninschriften* (Heidelberg, 1923), pp. 75 ff.

<sup>3</sup> ð, d, and ǰ have been written as ð, d, and g.

- VII. Bone utensil from Flöksand, Norway, *ca.* 350, Noreen, 20  
 lina laukaR alu  
 Linen, leek, protection
- VIII. Fæmo bracteate, Denmark, *ca.* 500, Noreen, 23  
 ek fakaR faihido  
 I Fakr wrote [this].
- IX. The Golden Horn of Gallehus, Denmark, *ca.* 400, Noreen, 25  
 ek hlewagastiR holtijaR horna tawido  
 I Hlegestr of Holt made the horn.
- X. Istaby stone, Sweden, *ca.* 650, Noreen, 31  
 afatr hariwulafa haþuwulafR heruwulafiR warait runaR þaiaR  
 To Heriulf. Holfr, Hiorulf's son, cut these runes.
- XI. Järsberg stone, Sweden, sixth century, Noreen, 32  
 ek erilaR ubaR haite harabanaR runoR waritu  
 Earl Ufr is my name. [I] Hrafn cut the runes.
- XII. Kjölevig stone, Norway, *ca.* 500, Noreen, 34  
 hadulaikaR ek hagustaldaR hlaiwido magu minino  
 Hoþleikr. I Haukstaldr buried my son.
- XIII. Kragehul lanceshaft, Denmark, *ca.* 400, Noreen, 35  
 ek erilaR asugisalas muha haite ga ga ga ginugaheliþa haga galawiju  
 bi gi. . . .  
 My name is Earl, Asgisl's follower. Good luck, good luck, good  
 luck! A clear-ringing work of art I deliver to. . . .
- XIV. Stora Noleby stone, Sweden, *ca.* 600, Noreen, 45  
 runo fahi raginakundo. . . .  
 Runes of the mighty ones I write. . . .
- XV. Overhornbæk bracteate, Denmark, sixth century, Noreen, 51  
 auþa þit eih uilald tauiu uontwa utl  
 Auþe owns this. [I] Votte fashion this work of art.
- XVI. Reistad stone, Norway, *ca.* 600, Noreen, 52  
 iuþingaR ek wakraR unnam wraitu  
 yþingr. I Vokr undertook the writing.
- XVII. Rõ stone, Sweden, *ca.* 400, Noreen, 55  
 swabaharjaR sairawidaR stainawarijaR fahido ek hraþaR satido  
 staina ana magu  
 Suafarr [of the sore-wounding spear?]. [I] Steinarr inscribed the  
 runes. I Hraþr erected the stone to my son.
- XVIII. Schonen bracteate, Sweden, fifth century, Noreen, 57  
 laþu laukaR gakaR alu  
 Love-gift. Laukr. Gakr. Amulet
- XIX. Seeland bracteate, Denmark, fifth century, Noreen, 58  
 hariuha haitika farauisa gibu auja. . . .  
 I am Herioe, master of dangerous knowledge. Good luck to. . . .

- XX. Skodborg bracteate, Denmark, fifth century, Noreen, 60  
 auja alawin auja alawin auja alawin ja alawid  
 Good luck to Allvin, good luck to Allvin, good luck to Allvin and  
 Allviþ!
- XXI. Stentofte stone, Sweden, second half of seventh century, Noreen, 66  
 niu haborumR niu hagestumR haþuwolafR gaf j hariwolafR eaus-  
 nuh . . . e haideRunono falah eka hedera ginoronoR heramal-  
 ausaR arageuweladaude saR bariutiþ  
 To the nine of Haborumr and Hagestumr. Holfr gave . . .  
 Heriolfr. . . . Here I hid a series of mighty runes of magic. . . .  
 A malicious death to him who breaks this stone.
- XXII. Ström whetstone, Norway, first half of seventh century, Johannes-  
 son, 62  
 wate hali hino horna hahaska þi haþu ligi  
 Let the horn moisten this hanging stone, so that the grass may lie.
- XXIII. Sölvesborg stone, Sweden, end of eighth century, Noreen, 70  
 aft asmunt sunu sin urti wapi. . . .  
 To Asmund, his son, Vape made. . . .
- XXIV. Kyrkö bracteate, Sweden, ca. 500, Noreen, 73  
 heldaR kunimundiu wurte runoR an walhakurne  
 Hialdr wrought the runes on the foreign coin for Kunmundr.
- XXV. Torsbjærg shield-boss, Denmark, ca. 300, Noreen, 76  
 aisagaiRaR aih  
 Eisgeirr owns [this].
- XXVI. Tune stone, Norway, ca. 500, Noreen, 79  
 . . . R woduride staina satida þrijoR dohtriR dailidun arbija  
 sijosteR arbijano ek wiwaR after woduride witanda-halaiban  
 worahto runoR  
 . . . r set up this stone to Oþriþr. Three daughters, the nearest  
 relatives of the heirs, shared the cost of the inheritance feast. I Vir  
 made the runes for Oþriþr the breadgiver.
- XXVII. Vi sword, Denmark, ca. 250, Noreen, 92  
 marihai ala makia  
 Alle to Mærer this sword.
- XXVIII. Asum bracteate, Sweden, fifth century, Noreen, 95  
 ehe ik akaR fahi  
 I Akr write the runes for E. . . .
- XXIX. The larger Nordendorf clasp, Germany, sixth to seventh century,  
 Feist, *Zs. f. d. Phil.*, XLIX, 1 ff.  
 ero þa gol wodaþ wigi þonaR awa leub wigie  
 Then Earth spoke the charm. May Thor be propitious! [We]  
 Awa and Leub consecrate [it].

The expressions in the foregoing inscriptions can be classified under the following heads:

1. The formula *ek* plus a title plus a name:  
*ek irilaR* [I], *ek erilaR ubaR* [XI], *ek erilaR asugisalas* [XIII]
2. Proper names which begin with the same consonant or which begin with a vowel:  
*hroRaR hroReR* [I], *gamR . . . glanta* [VI], *hariwulafa haþuwulafR heruwulafR* [X], *ehe . . . akaR* [XXVIII]
- 3a. Proper names used with a noun, adjective, or pronoun beginning with the same consonant or with a vowel:  
*hnabudas hlaiwa* [II], *mik marila* [V], *hlewagastiR holtijaR horna* [IX], *uilald . . . uontwa* [XV], *swabaharjaR sairawidaR* [XVII], *laþu laukaR* [XVIII], *haborumR . . . hagestumR haþuwolafR . . . hariwolafR . . . haideRunono* [XXI], *marihai . . . makia* [XXVII]
- 3b. Proper names used with a verb beginning with the same consonant or with a vowel or semi-vowel:  
*aiuwida . . . uha* [III], *fakaR faihido* [VIII], *hadulaikaR . . . hagu-staldaR hlaiwido* [XII], *auþa . . . eih* [XV], *wakraR . . . wraita* [XVI], *hariuha haitika* [XIX], *urti waþe* [XXIII], *aisagaiRaR aih* [XXV]
- 3c. Common nouns used with a verb beginning with the same consonant or semi-vowel:  
*wurte . . . walhakurne* [XXIV], *dohtriR dailidun* [XXVI]
- 3d. Mixed cases:  
*orte . . . aRina . . . alifu* [I], *wiwaR . . . woduride witandahalaiban worahto* [XXVI]
4. Expressions connected with the use of magic:  
*solu sot . . . sakse* [IV], [VII] *ga ga ga* [XIII], *runo raginakundo* [XIV], *auja alawin auja alawin auja alawin ja alawid* [XX], *hali . . . horna hahaska . . . haþu* [XXII], *wodan wigi . . . wigie* [XXIX]
5. Miscellaneous:  
*fiskR . . . fokl* [IV], *arbija . . . arbijano* [XXVI]

Let us now examine in order the phrases listed above. The formula *ek* plus a title of rank plus a name, with either one or both occurring, is very common and may be of great antiquity.<sup>1</sup> In the Old Norse inscriptions<sup>2</sup> it appears as follows: *ek irilaR hroRaR* (7),<sup>3</sup> *ek fakaR* (23), *ek hlewagastiR* (25), *ek erilaR ubaR* (32), *ek hagustaldaR* (34), *ek erilaR asugisalas* (35), *ek erilaR* (39), *ek gudija* (46), *ek wakraR* (52),

<sup>1</sup> S. Feist, *J.E.G. Phil.*, XXI (1922), 604, claims that the formula is of extreme religious and ritualistic antiquity.

<sup>2</sup> The term "Old Norse" is used as the equivalent of Noreen's *urnordisch*, and refers only to such inscriptions as are listed by Noreen and Johannesson.

<sup>3</sup> The numbers refer to Noreen.



*ek hrabaR* (55), *ek wiwaR* (79), *ek hagustaldiR* (84), *ek erilaR wiwala* (86), *ik akaR* (95). Clearly there was no intentional alliteration in such an expression as *ek erilaR ubaR* (XI). Similar examples can be readily cited from modern English such as "Earl E—," "Lord L—," etc.<sup>1</sup>

We come next to proper names beginning with the same consonant or with a vowel. Many examples show the antiquity of alliterative naming, e.g., *Segestes*, *Segimerus*, *Segimundus*; *Theodemer*, *Theoderich*, *Theodemund*, etc. The origin of the practice is obscure.<sup>2</sup> Alliterative naming, however, does not imply a conscious choice of words for poetic purposes. Of course if the alliterative names occur in a metrical line or if their sequence has been altered to conform to the technique of alliteration, a poetic purpose may be justly claimed. No instance in class 2 is metrical in form or shows any recognizable alteration of sequence. It may be claimed that the names were deliberately chosen for alliterative purposes. In such a line as *Heorogar ond Hroþgar ond Halga til*,<sup>3</sup> the poet *may* have invented the names for metrical purposes. But on a memorial stone with such an inscription as *gamR atR glanta*, the situation is entirely different, since, if the two names are to appear on the stone, there must of necessity be alliteration. This, however, is not alliteration used as a conscious poetic device.<sup>4</sup>

In class 3a we have proper names used with a noun, pronoun, or adjective. In *hnabudas hlaiwa* (II) the problem is to determine whether the word *hlaiwa* was used because it begins with *h*. In another inscription, *hariwulfs stainaR* (Noreen, 54), where we have practically the same idea conveyed there is no attempt at alliteration. If alliteration had been customary it is reasonable to assume that it would have been used in the latter case as well. The word *hlaiwa* may have been chosen for alliterative purposes, but is it very improbable. Let us, however, class it as a doubtful case. In *mik marila worta* (V) there is nothing but a conventional inscriptional form used as far back as the

<sup>1</sup> The word *erilar* did not have exactly the same meaning as English "Earl," but it at least indicated nobility.

<sup>2</sup> Such series of names as *Theode-mer*, *Theode-rich*, *Theode-mund*, and *hari-wulaR*, *hapu-wulaR*, *heru-wulaR* and many others of similar composition suggest one way in which the principle of alliterative naming may have originated.

<sup>3</sup> *Beowulf*, 61.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. a Greek inscription which Professor Buck (*Greek Dialects*, p. 241, 79) renders: "Atotus made this, an Argive and an Argead, son of Hagelaidus the Argive."

fifth century B.C. in a Latin inscription.<sup>1</sup> When the Old Norse inscription is translated into modern English all three words begin with the same consonant, "Mærle made me," but there is no indication of intentional alliteration here.

It will perhaps be claimed that the transposed word order indicates an attempt at metrical form. In the celebrated Golden Horn of Gallehus (IX), often claimed as the earliest example of Germanic alliterative verse,<sup>2</sup> we have also transposed word order. The inscription may have been intentionally put into metrical form, but if we compare *hlewagastiR horna tawido* (IX) with *dagaR runoR markiþe* it would appear as if we had here an inscriptional convention. Many inscriptions which are plainly prose have transposed word order: *dagaR runoR markiþe* (Noreen, 7), *aih sbindula taliþaR . . .* (Noreen, 21), and others.<sup>3</sup> We conclude, then, that the alliteration in *mik marila worta* (V) is unintentional.

It is quite true that the line on the Golden Horn (IX) is metrically correct according to the standards of the later alliterative verse, but if the word order is the result of inscriptional convention this agreement is accidental. More examples than have as yet been produced are necessary to prove that the alliterative line of the later poetry was known and used in the fifth century. Let us examine the inscription. The writer's name was *HlewagastiR*; he was making a *horna*. If there is intentional alliteration here then *HlewagastiR* either decided to make a horn because the word began with *h* or called himself *HlewagastiR* because the word for "horn" began with the same consonant, which is contrary to common sense. Yet the use of these two words satisfies the demands of alliteration even without the addition of the adjective *holtijaR*. There could not have been intentional alliteration in the use of the words *HlewagastiR* and *horna*. If the writer's name had been *FakaR* it would probably never have occurred to anybody to claim alliteration in this inscription. If the line was intended to be alliterative it is because of the choice of the adjective *holtijaR*, since *ek FakaR holtijaR horna tawido* would still have two alliterating words. Because of this possibility we shall put it in the doubtful class.

<sup>1</sup> *CIL*, XIV, 4123: *manios med fefaked Numasioi* ("Manius made me for Numerius").

<sup>2</sup> Cf. A. Heusler, *Deutsche Versgeschichte* (1925), p. 86, n. 1, and p. 93, § 115.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. F. Maurer, *Untersuchungen über die deutsche Verbstellung* (Heidelberg, 1926), p. 184, § 58.

To proceed with the others: in *uיללד . . . uontwa* (XV) we have a proper name used in conjunction with what appears to have been a conventional art-term as in *ek erilaR sa wilagaR haiteka* (Noreen, 39). The inscription is not metrical, and there is no more conscious alliteration present than in the phrase "I, Payne, wrote this play." The second word of *swabaharjaR sairawidaR* (XVII) has not been explained. Etymologically it may be the equivalent of the English "sore-wood." If this suggestion is correct the word probably had some such meaning as the "sore-wounding" or "spear," and was used as a descriptive adjective which would explain its appearance on a monument erected to a man to whom this epithet was applied while he was alive. In that case the alliteration was in all probability unconscious. This inscription belongs to the doubtful class. When *laþu laukaR* (XVIII) is compared with two parallel inscriptions, *frohila laþu* and *houhaR laþu alu* (Noreen, 12 and 22), it is evident that there is no case for intentional alliteration in this inscription. On the Stentoften stone (XXI) the four proper names (*haborumR . . . hagestumR haþuwolafR . . . hariwolafR . . . haideRrunono . . .*) are necessary to the inscription and could consequently not have been chosen for alliterative purposes. The inscription is not metrical. The Björketorp stone (Noreen, 4 [ca. 700]) was apparently copied in part from the Stentoften stone (XXI) since the latter part of the inscription (beginning with *haideRrunono*) is practically the same. There is no attempt at alliteration in the Björketorp stone. Obviously *haideRrunono* was the technical term for certain powerful runes and was used on both stones quite regardless of any alliterative principle. In *marihai ala makia* (XXVII) a sword is presented to *MarihaR* by *Ala*. Since the inscription can scarcely be classed as metrical and since *mæker* was a common word for "sword" it would be very hazardous to claim that the word was used in order to obtain alliteration. The situation is quite different in *Beowulf*, 1457, *wæs þæm hæstmæce Hrunting nama*, where the poet requires a word to alliterate with *Hrunting* and forms the compound accordingly. Scores of examples of unintentional alliteration similar to that in the foregoing inscription can be found in almost any book one may pick up.

Class 3b includes proper names used with a verb. There are eight examples listed above where either the proper name and the verb

begin with the same consonant or with a vowel. There is nothing unusual about this. Let us compare other inscriptions: *hroRaR hroReR orte* (7),<sup>1</sup> *dagaR runoR markiþe* (7), *dagaR þaR runo faihido* (16), *marila wohrte* (18), *aik taliþaR* (21), *hlewagastiR . . . . tawido* (25), *heruwulafiR warait* (31), *ubaR haite* (32), *harabanaR . . . . waritu* (32), *asugisalas . . . . haite* (35), *erilaR haiteka* (39), *frawaradaR slaginaR* (44), *hraþaR satido* (55), *skribado sigaduR* (69), *heldaR wurte* (73), *rhoaltR fai . . . .* (85). Here we have sixteen examples of a proper name plus a verb where the initial letters differ. Six of the eight verbs in the inscriptions in question appear once or oftener in the sixteen examples quoted where there is no alliteration. The alliteration in the inscriptions of this class is clearly unintentional.

There is no new principle in class 3c which requires discussion.

The first example of class 3d is *orte . . . . aRina . . . . alaifu* (I). The first part of the inscription reads *ek irilaR hroRaR hroReR*, and *orte* really belongs to it. The proper name could not have been a matter of choice since the monument was erected to *Alaifu*. If then the word *aRina* was chosen because it begins with a vowel, we would have an example of alliterative prose, since the inscription is not metrical. Let us put this also in the doubtful class.

In *ek wiwaR after woduride witandahalaiban worahto runoR* (XXVI) the two proper names were certainly not chosen for any alliterative purpose. *WiwaR . . . . worahto* belongs to class 3b; it may be compared with *heldaR . . . . wurte runoR* (Noreen, 73). The whole burden, then, for the claim of conscious alliteration rests upon the use of the word *witandahalaiban*. The word may be translated as "bread-giver," and may be compared with OE *hlāford*. It is just as probable to assume that the word *witandahalaiban* would have been used if the name preceding it had been *hagustaldaR* or any other as to assume that the word was chosen because it begins with *w*. The first part of the inscription is plainly in prose. That part of the inscription which is quoted above has been claimed as metrical, containing three short verses with alliteration.<sup>2</sup> One might reasonably ask those who make this doubtful claim why the writer of the runes should use prose for

<sup>1</sup> The numbers here all refer to Noreen.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. A. Heusler, *op. cit.*, p. 86, n. 1, and also p. 245; cf. also Johannesson, No. 72.

the first part and then adopt metrical form for the second, especially since the second part is just as prosaic in respect to content as the first. There is good reason for believing that what has been mistaken for early attempts at verse is nothing but a conventionalized inscriptional form which can be found with slight variations in many of the inscriptions, e.g., *afatr hariwulafa haþuwulafR heruwulafiR warait runaR þaiaR* (Noreen, 31), *heldaR kunimundiu wurte runoR . . .* (Noreen, 73), *ek irilaR hroRaR hroReR orte þat aRina ubt aliafu* (Noreen, 7), *ek hlewagastiR . . . tawido* (Noreen, 25), and others. However, in deference to the claims of Heusler and Johannesson we include this one in the doubtful class.

The first example (IV) in class 4, expressions connected with the use of magic, may also be called a doubtful case. The flat stone bearing the Eggjum runes in which *solu sot . . . sakse* (IV) occurs was buried and a charm put upon it to prevent sacrilegious meddling as in the Stentofthen and Björketorp stones. The runes of this inscription were cut at night with a sharp stone or some similar device but not with a cutting implement of metal, lest the magic potency be destroyed.<sup>1</sup> In *ni s solu sot uk ni sakse stain skorinn* (IV) Heusler sees a Germanic long-line, although the remainder of the inscription is prose.<sup>2</sup> If it is a Germanic long-line it is certainly a very irregular one, since it would have two accented syllables in the first half-line and three in the second. It is much more probable that the whole inscription, due possibly to its nature, is in rhythmic prose. Alliteration in rhythmic prose, is, however, not necessarily intentional, and in any case it is not the regulated alliteration of the later poetry. Moreover, the alliteration in *solu sot . . . sakse* could quite easily arise from the necessity of the statement of the magic charm and the conditions under which the runes were cut.

According to Schröder, the expression *lina laukaR* (VII) can be traced back to a religious ritualistic formula.<sup>3</sup> The last word of the inscription *alu* ("amulet") has magical significance. In *laukaR alu* (Noreen, 61) we have *laukaR* used in a similar way but with no at-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. F. R. Schröder, *G. R. Monatschrift*, X (1922), 10.

<sup>2</sup> Heusler, *op. cit.*, p. 86, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Schröder, *op. cit.*, pp. 9-10. Schröder connects the formula with the ritual of the *Pferdephallos* worship.

tempt at alliteration. It would appear, then, as if the words *lina* and *laukaR* owe their use to certain ritualistic customs which fixed them in traditional use, and consequently were not chosen for alliterative purposes. In *ga ga ga* (XIII), an abbreviation for *gibu auja*, we have formulistic repetition for magical purposes, in other words, part of the hocus-pocus of the charm. Whatever the reason for the repetition in certain charms and magical incantations may be, it would be difficult to establish the claim that it had its origin in conscious alliteration. *Runo raginakundo* (XIV) is another expression based upon magic belief and practice.<sup>1</sup> In *auja alawin auja alawin auja alawin ja alawid* (XX) the repetition is obviously designed to secure the potency of the charm. The rhythm is the inevitable result of the repetition of *auja alawin*, which is repeated for magical purposes. From this results the alliteration. This can scarcely be called a conscious use of alliteration, however, since magic potency is the cause of the repetition of *auja* and since *alawin* and *alawid* were certainly not chosen because they begin with a vowel.

In *wate hali hino horna hahaska pi hapu ligi* (XXII) we have an inscription which is undoubtedly metrical in form, although it is not a Germanic long-line. It is probably an *Arbeitslied*;<sup>2</sup> hence the characteristic movement, possibly representing one of the oldest of metrical forms. The inscription is written on a whetstone and was supposed to have a magic potency.<sup>3</sup> The potency of the charm rests upon two factors, namely, the mention of certain definite things intimately associated with the desired result, *hali hahaska*, *horna*, *hapu*, and the rhythmic movement which seems to suggest the actual use of the whetstone on the scythe or sickle. It is reasonable to assume that in a popular charm things will be called by their common names rather than by unusual, archaic, or literary names. Now the things which have to be mentioned in order to insure the potency of the charm all have names which begin with the same consonant. Under such circumstances it is difficult to see how a good case for the intentional use of alliteration can be established. It is much more probable that the alliteration is the result of the necessities of magic formulation. The form of this and similar charms, arising as it does from the rhyth-

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 14.

<sup>2</sup> *Cf. ibid.*, p. 12.

<sup>3</sup> *Cf. ibid.*



mic movement of the task performed, can scarcely be classed as sophisticated, which makes it all the more improbable that the alliteration was the result of conscious art. However, let us class it as a doubtful case.

We now come to the last inscription in this class, the larger Nordendorf clasp. The inscription which is written on the reverse side of the ornament is in two parts. The first part is *ero þa gol wodaŋ wigi þonar* in three lines on the right half of the surface; the second part is *awa leub wigie*, written across the top on the left, apparently in a different hand and certainly an addition to the first part, since the runes, which are large and somewhat crudely formed, are crowded together toward the end. The last part, then, being a later addition, can be disregarded. Feist claims that *wigi þonar* was a magic formula and gives other examples of its use.<sup>1</sup> The claim for alliteration then rests upon the use of the word *wodaŋ* which Feist interprets as meaning "Zauberspruch," a transference of the name of the chief magician to the name of the thing. That this was done intentionally for the sake of alliteration in an otherwise unmetrical inscription is possible but very improbable.

We have remaining the two cases in class 5: *fiskr . . . fokl* (IV) and *arbija . . . arbijano* (XXVI). If the name Ormar is hidden in the words *fiskr* and *fokl*, there can be no question of conscious alliteration, since the words were chosen because association of ideas connected with them would give the word *Ormare* (dat. of Ormar) and for this reason alone. There is nothing about *arbija . . . arbijano* which requires discussion. It is *figura etymologica* in many languages, and as an isolated case cannot be claimed as an indication of conscious alliteration.

The Anglo-Saxon runic inscriptions need not concern us. They either contain no alliteration or are under the influence of the literary verse. Some of the later Scandinavian inscriptions are written in the same style as the earlier ones; some of them are partly in prose and partly in alliterative verse of the Northern variety. Clearly literary influences were beginning to change the style of the inscriptions. It

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Zs. f. d. Phil.*, XLIX, 8, n. 1. Feist claims that the inscription is of Anglo-Frisian or Northern origin.

is, however, very significant that the older style continued in part to maintain itself, even at a time when we can reasonably suppose Scaldic poetry to have been in a most flourishing condition. In such matters tradition is very tenacious.

Of the many runic inscriptions in Scandinavia, Continental Europe, and England<sup>1</sup> only twenty-nine can have any bearing upon the problem of the origin of alliteration in Germanic verse. Of these twenty-nine, twenty-one do not contain evidence of conscious alliteration. There are eight doubtful cases. These are:

- I. ek . . . . hroRaR . . . . orte þat aRina ubt alaifu [see above, p. 404]
- II. hnabudas hlaiwa [see above, p. 401]
- IV. . . . ni s solu sot uk ni sakse stain skorinn [see above, p. 405]
- IX. ek hlewagastiR holtijaR horna tawido [see above, p. 402]
- XVII. swabaharjaR sairawidaR . . . [see above, p. 403]
- XXII. wate hali hino horna hahaska þi haþu ligi [see above, p. 406]
- XXVI. ek wiwaR after woduride witandahalaiban worahto runoR [see above, p. 404]
- XXIX. ero þa gol wodaþ wigi þonaR [see above, p. 407]

In time these are distributed all the way from the end of the fifth century to the beginning of the eighth. They have no common metrical principle. No evidence can be obtained from them which would lead to the establishment of any general alliterative practice. Furthermore, not one of these eight inscriptions presents indubitable intentional alliteration.

FRANCIS OWEN

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

<sup>1</sup> Noreen lists ninety-five Old Norse inscriptions. R. Henning, *Die Deutschen Runendekmäler* (Strassburg, 1889), gives sixteen. Later discoveries can be found in A. Götze, *Die althüringischen Funde von Weimar* (Berlin, 1912). For the large number of English runic inscriptions see Stephens, *Old Northern Runic Monuments*; Sweet, *Oldest English Texts* (1885); W. Viëtor, *Die Northumbriischen Runensteine* (Marburg, 1895), and *Das Angelsächsisches Runenkästchen* (Marburg, 1901).

## DRYDEN VERSUS SETTLE

The rage of John Dryden against Elkanah Settle, at this distance, remains an unexplained mystery. We may perhaps comprehend why Shadwell should have been considered worthy to be pilloried immortally as *Og*, but the animus with which the laureate imprisoned the pitiful head of *Doeg* passes understanding. The truth of the matter is that steadily from 1673, when Dryden sent his first blow against *The Empress of Morocco*, until 1682, when the second part of *Absalom and Achitophel* delivered the final coup de grâce, Settle was by all odds the most potent adversary in Dryden's field, and one whom the witty age considered entirely worthy of his mettle. That this has escaped notice is due chiefly to the fact that three of Settle's most sprightly satirical offspring have had other authorship fathered upon them, where, in each case, the recipient seems to have been well contented to pick up the waif and rear it as his own.

The battle of the poets had its rise in the controversy of 1673, which seethed for a time around Settle's *Empress of Morocco*. The success of this tragedy had so discomposed the rival playwrights that an ill-assorted junta of Dryden, Shadwell, and Crowne was formed for the attack. They hardly achieved their purpose, in the judgment of the town, and thus for a while Settle rested upon a well-deserved victory. From 1673 until 1681 there was supposedly a truce, after which the battle was renewed. It may be granted that Settle's *Absalom Senior* of 1682, with its recollection of certain shady spots in Dryden's career, justified much of the vehemence of the answer in the second part of *Absalom and Achitophel*; nevertheless there remains a residue in the portraiture of *Doeg* still to be explained. This paper is the account of an uninterrupted warfare of nearly ten years' duration, which finally had its great climax in an outstanding masterpiece of English satire.

Early in 1677 there circulated among the coffee-houses a satirical *Trial of the Poets for the Bays*, called elsewhere after the generic title of such ephemera, *The Session of the Poets*. The earliest reference to this endlessly quoted poem seems to be in the correspondence of

Henry Savile and John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester. Savile had written under date of November 1, 1677, of a libel sent lately by post to Will's and judged by its excellence to have been composed at Woodstock. Without specifically denying that he was the author, Rochester had answered: "For *the Libell* you speak of, upon that *most unworthy Generation the present Poets*, I rejoice in it with all my Heart, and shall take it for a Favour, if you will send me a *Copy*. He cannot want Wit utterly, that has a *Spleen to those Rogues*, though never so dully express'd."<sup>1</sup>

Thus we see *The Session of the Poets* in its first search for a father. Subsequent generations have used it as the unstable foundation for most of Rochester's relations to the other poets, but at the time the aggrieved playwrights were not slow in guessing the true author. When, after a passage of some six years, the Tories found it convenient to exhume the past of Elkanah, they recalled how "Captain" Otway, "a Man of the Sword as well as the Pen, finding himself most coarsely dealt withal had immediately call'd [Settle] to account, and required the satisfaction of a Gentleman from him." After some preliminaries, Elkanah "presently took *Pen, Ink, and Paper* out of his Pocket, [and] writ these following words, (*viz*) *I confess I Writ the Session of the Poets, and am very sorry fo't and am the Son of A Whore* for doing it; Witness my hand E.S."<sup>2</sup> Settle himself subsequently abjured the fact, and set down the *Session of the Poets* as "an ill natured scurrilous Lampoon, written some years since, and now laid as believed at the Fathers Door, being printed amongst Lord *Rs*— Poems,"<sup>3</sup> yet it is to be observed that other poets noticed the scandal. Shadwell alludes to it in his *Tory Poets* (1682), Otway himself in *The Poets Complaint* (1680), where he describes the author accurately, and finally Dryden seems to point at the circumstances in his lines to *Doeg*: "For Almonds he'll cry Whore to his own Mother."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Collected Works of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester* (London, 1926), p. 254. Mr. Hayward in his note to this letter endeavors to explain this as a reference to *A Satyr upon the Poets, being a Translation of the 7th Satyr of Juvenal*. The latter is printed correctly in Waller's edition of *Prior's Poems* and by internal evidence may be dated about 1688, many years after these events.

<sup>2</sup> *A Character of the True Blue Protestant Poet* (1682). The whole subject of this "duel" with Otway together with that of the latter with Churchill, the future Duke of Marlborough, I treated in *MLN*, XLI (February, 1926), 73-80.

<sup>3</sup> *A Supplement to the Narrative* (1683).

<sup>4</sup> *Abelom and Achitophel*, Part II, l. 729.

Since most of this evidence is from prejudiced sources, let us examine the poem itself. It has been variously attributed to Rochester and to Buckingham. We may dispose of the latter quickly. He was notorious, in a pilfering age, for resting his wit upon collaboration, nor was this poem ascribed to him until a careless edition of 1704, when time had silenced the rival claimants. Buckingham therefore may be eliminated. As to Rochester's claim, the satire bears not the slightest resemblance to his indubitable work, such, for example, as his *Allusion to Horace, The Tenth Satire of the First Book*. It might be ruled out upon no other grounds than that Rochester was accustomed to deal almost exclusively with his peers in poetry and in birth, and not, as in this satire, with all the innumerable small-fry of Fetter Lane. The *Tryal of the Poets* moves in circles lower even than that of the laureate, tracing accurately in its orbit all the enmities and rivalries of Elkanah Settle. Dryden, Crowne, and Shadwell are the chief legatees of a venom stored up since the days of the *Empress of Morocco*. Durfey, Mrs. Behn, and Otway, the latter of whom Settle despised as the "dear zany" of Shadwell, were next in line as their associates. But of his good friend Ravenscroft, to whose plays Settle had contributed advice and on one occasion a prologue, Settle devoted only one significantly harmless line: "At last *Mamamouche* put in for a share."<sup>1</sup> Beyond this, perhaps the most convincing argument for Settle's authorship is in the gentleness of the poet's attack upon Settle himself. It sheds light, moreover, upon so many diverse issues that it should be quoted complete:

Poet *Settle*, his *Tryal* was the next came about,  
He brought in an *Ibrahim* with the Preface torn out,<sup>2</sup>  
And humbly desir'd he might give no Offense;

<sup>1</sup> I quote from an unnoticed contemporary manuscript version in the Bodleian (Rawl. Poet 159). In all subsequent printed texts *Mamamouche* is replaced by the gibberish, *Anababaluthu*. Ravenscroft was author of *Mamamouche* (1675). Incidentally the next line following seems to clarify the disputed authorship of the popular comedy of *Tom Essence* (1677): "And little *Tom Essence's* Author was there." Hazlitt contended that Ravenscroft was likewise author of this play, but the "and" seems to set aside his authorship. On the authority of Langbaine (art., "Rawlins"), the play generally has been assigned to Thomas Rawlins. Langbaine, however, merely described the author as "a Mr. Rawlins." All the persons of *The Tryal of the Poets* were distinctly alive in 1677 whereas Thomas Rawlins, the engraver and playwright, as certainly died in 1670. Cf. Winstanley, *Lives* (1687), p. 169.

<sup>2</sup> Of the several copies of the first edition of *Ibrahim* I have seen, only that of the British Museum (841.c.24) has this Preface. For the proper understanding of the relations of Settle and Shadwell it is an important document.

Dam[n] him, cries *Shadwell*, he cannot write Sense:  
 And b— cry'd *Newport*, I hate that dull Rogue;<sup>1</sup>  
*Apollo* considering he was not in Vogue,  
 Would not trust his dear Bays with so modest a Fool,  
 And bid the great Boy should be sent back to School.

The mildness of this simulated assault of Settle upon himself gathers interest when we recall the words of which he had once before complained. In the Preface to *Ibrahim* he sets it down that Shadwell's cry in all companies was: "*Damme [he] can't write Sence nor Grammar.*"<sup>2</sup>

There remains only to conclude this treatment of *The Tryal of the Poets* by orienting it with the attack upon Dryden. It was not unduly severe upon the laureate, unless in the unpardonable reference, repeated in *Absalom Senior*, to Dryden's mistress and to his rumored inclination toward priesthood:

But *Apollo* had heard the Story ith' Town  
 Of his quitting the *Muses*, to wear the black Gown;  
 And so gave him leave now his Poetry's done,  
 To let him turn Priest since R[eeve] is turn'd Nun.

Thus rested the battle for a period of about four years.

When Dryden returned to the attack, in November of 1681, the alignment on Parnassus was entirely reformed. Settle's forces had been strengthened by the accession of Shadwell and one Samuel Pordage, son of John Pordage of Reading, the latter an astrologer and student of Boehme. These three with the help of the Whig journalists were now the green-ribbon defenders of religious and civil liberties, and their blows, at least in the case of Shadwell and Settle, were not then subject for jest, however much time and the titles of *Og* and *Doeg* were to sink them. It was therefore to them that Shaftesbury naturally turned as edition after edition of Dryden's *Absalom*

<sup>1</sup> Quoted from *Buckingham's Works* (1704), a correct version. I have deleted in this line a particularly obscene exclamation that does not much concern our understanding of the poem, save that Hayward in reprinting it (*op. cit.*) utilized the imperfect text from the *State Poems* of 1697, instead of that of *Rochester's Works* (1680). Consequently, he has printed "B—cks," where I have inserted the dash. This has led him to write a long note upon the dramatist Banks, destroying all unity of this description of "brawny" Settle. Elsewhere in his edition the misplacing of two lines in the attack upon Otway makes that whole section nonsense. A bad text and a faulty theory of authorship have led to various other errors.

<sup>2</sup> The likeness of these lines was observed by F. C. Brown, *Elkanah Settle* (Chicago, 1910), p. 32.

and *Achitophel* disappeared from the booksellers' stalls. There had already been several half-hearted answers, when *Azaria and Hushai* appeared, published about the seventeenth of January 1681/82 and attributed by all the weight of authority to Pordage. Though it was early assigned to Settle by Anthony Wood, the ascription was questioned by Dr. Johnson, who argued that since Settle also composed *Absalom Senior*, published the sixth of April, it was somewhat unlikely that he should write twice upon the same occasion.<sup>1</sup> Malone verified the doubt by the discovery of Luttrell's manuscript notation that it was by Pordage.<sup>2</sup> This seemed to conclude the matter, despite the agreement of John Dennis and Theophilus Cibber with Wood.<sup>3</sup> There is extant, moreover, a stronger piece of evidence for Pordage—evidence that was very likely the basis of Luttrell's note. In the *Observer* of April 5, 1681/82 the author was definitely stated to be "Limping Pordage, a son of the Famous Familist about Reading, . . . and violently suspected for the *Medal Revers'd*."

It is perhaps needless to insist, in answer to Johnson, that the two dates are not so close but that Settle, laboring as he was under an obsession, might easily have returned to the charge for a second, or even a third time. It was an age of fevered political calumny, when the presses were driven overtime to keep apace of copy. But to those disturbed overmuch by the repetition, it may be recalled that Spence had evidence that in *Absalom Senior* Settle was assisted by various hands. It has never been suggested, on the contrary, that more than one writer was concerned in the creation of *Azaria and Hushai*, and that that one was not Pordage might well rest upon the obvious inadequacy of the latter, as demonstrated in any of his unquestioned works, to handle his weapons with the skill displayed in this satire. Add the significant fact that Settle had already edited his weaker brother's first play (*Herod and Mariamne*, 1673), and we have the setting for Elkanah's shift to Pordage of his overpowerful offspring. The deed is described by the anonymous author of *The Character of a*

<sup>1</sup> *Lives of the Poets* (ed. Hill; London, 1905), I, 374. The various dates are those of Luttrell's MS notations.

<sup>2</sup> *Prose Works of John Dryden*, I, i, 160.

<sup>3</sup> Brown accepts Pordage without question, as do Scott, Saintsbury, and Thorn-Drury, the latter of whom sums up the matter by writing that "Wood is apt to be unreliable in his statements as to the authorship of poetical tracts; he thought *Azaria and Hushai* was written by Settle" (*RSS*, I, 82).



*True Blue Protestant Poet*. He states that *Azaria and Hushai* was "by the greatest part of the Town accounted" Settle's, "but since *The Illegitimate Brat* had not the Strength to Support itself, and found its deformity and weakness gave no credit to the *Vigorous Abilities* of the Father, He ('tis said) has laid it at an Impotent, Lame Mans door, who because he never had any of his own, . . . gladly adopted the Bastard."

Crowne was hardly less unfavorable in his account of the transaction. There appears in his *City Politiques*, banned in June of 1682,<sup>1</sup> a portrait of one Craffy, who has been taken to be the composite likeness of Pordage, Shadwell, and Settle.<sup>2</sup> There seems, however, to be no reasonable doubt but that Craffy represents Crowne's return assault upon Settle alone. By the character description in the dramatis personae we would seem to have some allusion to Otway's unpleasant charge against the honor of Settle's mother, who in the play itself amply justified the character given her: "Craffy . . . an impudent, amorous, pragmatistical Fopp, that pretends to Wit and Poetry, in love with his father's Wife." In the development of this character there is a great deal that is to our purpose, of which two examples may suffice:

CRAF: A *Tory*? that's a good one, when I'm now writing an answer to Absalom and Achitophel. . . .

POD: What do you call this Poem?

CRAF: *Azariah and Hushai*.<sup>3</sup>

Somewhat later in the play Crowne reverts to the subject:

CRAF: I'm now answering the Meddal.

POD: I thought as much. The Devil take thy poetry.<sup>4</sup>

If there had been something of Pordage in this compound, Crowne certainly would have alluded to his lameness or to the wizardry of his sire—points which were never neglected in his case. Dryden, furthermore, was too greatly injured in *Azaria and Hushai* to pass its author lightly. Whereas to *Doeg* he devoted one of his most powerful passages, to Pordage he hardly deigned the notice of a single couplet:

Some in my Speedy pace I must outrun,  
As lame *Mephibosheth* the Wizard's Son. . . .<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Nicoll, *Restoration Drama*, p. 10 n.

<sup>2</sup> *City Politiques* (1683), p. 15.

<sup>3</sup> A. F. White, *John Crowne* (1922), p. 131.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 19.

<sup>5</sup> *Absalom and Achitophel*, Part II, ll. 404, 405.

And finally that Luttrell's ascription was not correct, though justified perhaps by the casual rumor of the time, seems fairly proved by one bit of evidence that has been neglected, namely, the existence of a copy of *Azaria and Hushai* with the contemporary manuscript notation upon the title-page: "For my worthy Friend Mr. Pordage."<sup>1</sup>

It is needless to quote the attack upon Dryden at any great length. However, it is not quite so innocuous as some of the critics would have it. We may judge by four lines:

Tell me, Apollo, for I cant divine,  
Why Wives he curs'd and prais'd the Concubine,  
Unless it were that he had led his life  
With a teeming matron ere she was a Wife.

Venomous as this may be, Settle nevertheless is nowhere so vituperative as Shadwell. His mud-slinging is the calculated work of the mercenary penman rather than the splenetic hatred of his fatter colleague. This comparison of the two Whigs may give some slight explanation to Dryden's effort to hide his wounds:

Spightful he is not, though he wrote a Satyr,  
For still there goes some *thinking* to ill-Nature.<sup>2</sup>

In building up this legend of complete futility, Dryden nowhere wrought more happily than when he hit upon Settle's pseudonym of *Doeg*, of which not the least happy part was that Settle himself first used it, in his *Azaria and Hushai*, as an insult to the traitor Danby, who had conspired to sell his country's honor to France. Settle seems to have forgotten, in resurrecting this Edomite traitor, his own recent apostasy to the Tory cause and not to have envisaged another yet to come. The name becomes more interesting when we contemplate the ancient Hebrew meaning of *Doeg*. When he chose the name of "the fearful one," was Dryden perhaps inspired with a memory of Settle's hapless duel with Otway?

But to return to our problem of authorship. If *Azaria and Hushai* is indeed Settle's, its companion piece, *The Medal Revers'd*, which is set down on the title-page as "By the Author of *Azaria and Hushai*," must be counted his also. The two poems bear to each other the strongest resemblance. In the aggregate, along with those portions of

<sup>1</sup> P. J. Dobell, *The Literature of the Restoration* (London, 1918), p. 54.

<sup>2</sup> *Absalom and Achitophel*, Part II, ll. 421, 422.

*Absalom Senior* which were by Settle's hand, there seems in them sufficient motivation for Dryden's bitterness, and to Settle is given a degree more of solidity than that of a mere figure of straw. As to the decision of the age upon the battle, we may add to Dennis' well-known testimony this less frequently quoted observation of the bookseller John Dunton:

. . . . Mr. *Dryden* found him smart enough, and cou'd ha' wish'd himself safe out of his Hands.

But, alas! after all, when I see an Ingenious Man set up for a *meer Poet*, and steer his Course through Life towards that Point of the Compass, I give him up as one *prick'd down by Fate*, for misery and misfortune.<sup>1</sup>

While Settle himself, a promising man gone wrong, in after-years meditated gloomily upon his misspent powers and put the blame more properly where it belonged: "Alas I was grown weary of my little Talent in Innocent Dramaticks, and forsooth must be rambling into Politicks; and much I have got by't, for, I thank 'em, they have undone me. . . ."<sup>2</sup>

ROSWELL G. HAM

YALE UNIVERSITY

<sup>1</sup> *Life and Errors* (London, 1705), p. 243.

<sup>2</sup> *Distress'd Innocence* (1691), Preface.

## DRYDEN, HOBBS, AND THE ROYAL SOCIETY

When students of Dryden have encountered the problem of his relation to the Royal Society and the new science, they have generally passed by on the other side. They have, of course, included in their biographical narratives the fact that he was chosen a member of the newly organized Society on November 19, 1662, and admitted at the next meeting, November 26; but with no significance attached except that Dryden must at this time have enjoyed the social status of a gentleman.<sup>1</sup> As to any intellectual sympathy with the new movement, comment has been meager and conflicting; Christie declares that Dryden "had no accurate knowledge" of science, whereas Scott, more generously but equally without documentation, says that "Dryden, who through life was attached to experimental philosophy, speedily associated himself with those who took interest in its progress." In an elaborate study of the new science in relation to literature,<sup>2</sup> Mr. Carson S. Duncan has been cursory, but severe, in his treatment of Dryden. Although he found that the poet had introduced here and there some imagery derived from science—thus obeying, says Mr. Duncan, "the injunction of Bishop Sprat"<sup>3</sup>—yet he found also imagery drawn from such sources as astrology or the Ptolemaic astronomy. "From all which," concluded Mr. Duncan, "it follows that Dryden was not deeply impressed with the new philosophy. It seems never to have occurred to him that it was a serious matter to know the truth about nature, or at least to be consistent about its representation." "Dryden was practically unaffected by the new intellectual impulse."<sup>4</sup> As to the sources of his poetic imagery, Dryden went all his life both to the new and the old science. But he would

<sup>1</sup> Malone, *Critical and Miscellaneous Prose Works of John Dryden*, I (1800), 49-50; Scott, *Life of Dryden*, in *Works of Dryden* (ed. Scott and Saintsbury), I, 46-47; W. D. Christie, "Memoir" in Globe edition of *Poetical Works*, p. xxv; J. Churton Collins, *Essays and Studies* (1895), p. 18. Saintsbury, in his volume in the "English Men of Letters Series," does not even mention Dryden's membership in the Royal Society.

<sup>2</sup> *The New Science and English Literature in the Classical Period* (Menasha, Wis., 1913).

<sup>3</sup> See Sprat, *History of the Royal Society*, Part III, sec. xxxv (2d ed., 1702), pp. 413-19.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 43-45 and 179.

probably have defended the latter as he does the supernatural in poetry, by an appeal to folk-lore. "It is enough that, in all ages and religions, the greatest part of mankind has believed the power of magic, and that there are spirits or spectres which have appeared. This, I say, is foundation enough for poetry."<sup>1</sup> Without raising further, therefore, the question of Dryden's knowledge of science as shown in his metaphors and similes, this paper will approach more directly the larger question whether or not "Dryden was practically unaffected by the new intellectual impulse," or whether he at least possessed any characteristic attitudes or ideas which might indicate sympathetic interest in the Royal Society and the new science.

## I

First of all, there are two common errors to be avoided in defining the intellectual impulse of the new science. One is to describe the new science as mainly Baconian in nature, as merely collection and classification of specimens. Bacon's prestige with the Royal Society and his great influence in fostering the inductive method must of course be admitted. The scientists of the seventeenth century were his disciples in their respect for facts and their suspicion of hasty generalization; the gentlemen *virtuosi* collected rarities with truly Baconian zeal. But the most significant element of the new science was not to be found in these collectors' cabinets, so frequently ridiculed in the literature of the time; neither is it to be found in the works of Bacon. The new philosophy of science, or, as it was then called, the "new philosophy of motion," was the result of the application of mathematics to physics and astronomy; and Bacon had completely ignored mathematics. "In this respect," says Whitehead, "Bacon completely missed the tonality which lay behind the success of seventeenth century science. Science was becoming, and has remained, primarily quantitative."<sup>2</sup>

It is also a mistake to suppose that the profoundest effect of the Copernican system upon general ideas was the shift of the center of the universe from the earth to the sun. The shock of this revelation,

<sup>1</sup> *Essay on Heroic Plays*, in *Works* (ed. Scott and Saintsbury), IV, 22.

<sup>2</sup> A. N. Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World* (New York, 1925), p. 66.

great as it had been at first, was not greatly felt in England, at least, after 1660. And during the process of popularizing the heliocentric theory, other problems of deeper and more permanent import emerged and became the real storm center. These deeper problems, again, were the result of the application of mathematics to astronomy and physics. ✓

The development of mathematics and its triumphant application to the phenomena of motion constitutes undoubtedly one of the greatest revolutions in the history of thought. It has so completely permeated even the "common sense" view of the world of the average modern man that only by effort can we understand the conception of motion which preceded it. The medieval interpretation was animistic. ✓ The Middle Ages asked the question, "Why do bodies move?" And their answer was that they move because they have a desire to. ✓ Gravitation is due to each thing seeking its appropriate place; nature abhors a vacuum; Kepler, in his *Mysterium cosmographicum* (1597), explained that planets move because they have "moving souls" (*animae motrices*);<sup>1</sup> Gilbert described the magnetic force he had discovered as "of the nature of soul, surpassing the soul of man"; Harvey believed that the motion of the heart and blood is due to "innate heat," which is not fire nor derived from fire; and the blood, he said, is not occupied by a spirit, but is a spirit, "celestial in nature, the soul, that which answers to the essence of the stars . . . is something analogous to heaven, the instrument of heaven."<sup>2</sup> ✓ Medieval thought sought for the essence of motion as an answer to the question why bodies move. As a matter of fact, the new science of the seventeenth century did not answer this question, but only deprived it of its interest. The new science demonstrated that all motion is regular and mathematically measurable, and thenceforth the real question became, "How do bodies move?" ✓ Thus Kepler, after many years of astronomical calculations, ultimately rejected his "moving souls" as unnecessary. The seventeenth century, as a period in the development of thought, is particularly notable for its many geniuses in the related fields of mathematics, physics, and astronomy, who by a vast co-operative effort added stone to stone in this new philosophic structure,

<sup>1</sup> Höffding, *History of Modern Philosophy* (London, 1900), I, 168-69.

<sup>2</sup> T. C. Albutt, *Science and Medieval Thought* (London, 1901), pp. 41 ff.

until Newton completed it, a new universe of cause and effect, a vast machine, whose every mystery must be amenable to the laws of mathematics.<sup>1</sup>

Thus arose in a new and much more perplexing and dangerous form the ancient problem of materialism. Even Descartes felt constrained to regard living organisms as machines, although he of course admitted that man has also a "rational soul," and thus established the famous and influential Cartesian dualism. But there were many who accepted the mechanical theory without adding to it this idealistic superstructure which contradicted it. Hence the great popularity in the seventeenth century of the atomistic philosophy of Democritus, Epicurus, and Lucretius, who not only affected the general tone of sophisticated society by stimulating "libertine" thought, but influenced as well the new science.<sup>2</sup> The French philosopher Gassendi combined ancient atomism with the new science of his own day, thereby preparing for Newton's rejection of the vortex theory of Descartes and the foundation of modern atomism. Voltaire, in his *Elements of the Philosophy of Newton*, pointed out, probably not without some malicious satisfaction, the great prestige and importance, in the eyes of the pious Newton, of the materialistic ancient atheists and their modern disciple:

Newton suivait les anciennes opinions de Démocrite, d'Epicure et d'une foule de philosophes rectifiées par notre célèbre Gassendi. Newton a dit plusieurs fois à quelques françois qui vivent encore, qu'il regardait Gassendi comme un esprit très juste et très sage, et qu'il ferait gloire d'être entièrement de son avis dans toutes les choses dont on vient de parler.<sup>3</sup>

As for the materialistic implications of the new science, however, they were much more hospitably received among lay gentlemen, such as cultivated the gay cynicism of "libertine" thought, than among professional men of science. On the other hand, those members of the

<sup>1</sup> See W. Whewell, *History of the Inductive Sciences* (London, 1837), and *Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences* (London, 1840); E. A. Burt, *The Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Physical Science* (1925), with Bibliography; A. J. Snow, *Matter and Gravity in Newton's Physical Philosophy* (1926), with Bibliography; also the volumes by Albutt and Whitehead referred to above.

<sup>2</sup> See Lange, *History of Materialism* (Eng. trans.; Boston, 1877); Kurd Lasswitz, *Geschichte der Atomistik* (Hamburg, 1890); L. Mabileau, *Histoire de la philosophie atomistique* (Paris, 1895).

<sup>3</sup> Quoted by Lange, *op. cit.*, I, 267, n. 12. Gassendi was not in fact an atheist, but outside of scientific circles he was regarded with suspicion and, the "libertines" appealed to his authority.



Royal Society who were doing significant scientific work were also pious men who held dear that religious and idealistic tradition which their scientific work was putting on the defensive. From this dilemma sprang much of the characteristic thought not only of the seventeenth century, but of the modern era. As Whitehead says, "The history of thought in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is governed by the fact that the world had got hold of a general idea which it could neither live with nor live without."<sup>1</sup> But the apologetics of the Royal Society will be understood better if we first consider Hobbes, the most distinguished and the most uncompromising of the contemporary adherents of the dreaded materialism.

## II

The mental history of Hobbes is typical of the mathematical and physical preoccupations of the seventeenth century. His philosophical awakening came at the age of forty, when he accidentally opened a book of Euclid and became enchanted by the certainty of mathematical demonstration. Along with Euclid he studied Galileo, from whom, it appears, he derived his fundamental mechanical theory, which he proceeded to apply both to the world and to man.<sup>2</sup> Science is the study of causes, but all causes are ultimately reducible to motion. A complete science should begin with a study of simple motions, then proceed to more complex motions in geometry, thence to physics, until we reach the most complex motions in "moral philosophy, in which we are to consider the motions of the mind . . . what causes they have, and of what they be causes."<sup>3</sup> To complete his scheme, Hobbes also insisted that the soul is material, a sort of thin, filmy substance, which could thus be assumed to be a part of the mechanical world. The customary theological definition of soul as "incorporeal substance" he ridiculed as meaningless. The soul, he said, has dimension as the body has, though he admitted it has no color. In response to his theological critics, Hobbes declared himself willing to accept on faith such incomprehensible beings as God and the angels,

<sup>1</sup> Whitehead, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

<sup>2</sup> W. R. Sorley, *History of English Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1920), pp. 49-50. But this early indebtedness to Galileo has been questioned by Frithjof Brandt, *Den Mekaniske Naturpfaeltelse hos Thomas Hobbes* (Copenhagen, 1921), pp. 72-81.

<sup>3</sup> *Elements of Philosophy*, Part I, chap. vi, especially secs. 5 and 6, in *English Works* (ed. Molesworth), I, 131-32.

though he suggested with fine irony that "the Scripture favoureth them more, that hold angels and spirits corporeal, than them that hold the contrary."<sup>1</sup>

In spite of this thoroughgoing mechanistic view of the world, Hobbes always professed himself a Christian and a submissive adherent of the Church of England as by law established. Obedience to authority, he said, is the cardinal virtue in political and ecclesiastical matters. But it was well understood already by his contemporaries that under this outward acceptance of Christianity he attempted to conceal a nature in which the religious instincts remained undeveloped. His reaction was significant when early in his philosophical career he was asked for comments on Descartes' *Discours*. His own mechanical and materialistic philosophy was already definitely formulated, and he opposed it to the idealism of Descartes. His manner was as tart as his reasoning keen; he reduced the whole spiritualistic philosophy to corporeal motion, "et ainsi l'esprit ne sera rien autre chose qu'un mouvement en certaines parties du corps organique."<sup>2</sup> As both men were irritated by their mutual lack of sympathy, their relations never passed beyond an acquaintance. And the philosophy of Descartes, which had so much in common with Plato, Augustine, and Anselm, became for half a century in England one of the most trusted modes of escape from Hobbism and materialism, especially among the Cambridge Platonists and the members of the Royal Society.

For Hobbism spread rapidly, and after 1650 the philosopher of Malmesbury, already past sixty, became for nearly thirty years more the center of a storm of controversy which reverberated throughout Europe. That he had many friends and disciples is certain, although some of the names in the long list given by his friend John Aubrey are open to suspicion.<sup>3</sup> His popularity with Charles II and the court was a thorn in the side of his enemies, though it does not appear to have rested entirely on a philosophical basis:

Order was given that he should have free accesse to his majesty, who was always much delighted in his witt and smart repartees. The witts at Court

<sup>1</sup> *Human Nature*, chap. xl, secs. 2-5; ed. cit., IV, 59-62.

<sup>2</sup> Descartes, *Troisièmes objections contre les Méditations*, in *Œuvres* (ed. Simon), pp. 198-99.

<sup>3</sup> *Brief Lives* (ed. A. Clark; Oxford, 1898), I, 365-72.

were wont to bayte him. But he feared none of them, and would make his part good. The king would call him *the beare*: "Here comes the beare to be bayted!"<sup>1</sup>

But he enjoyed also the friendship and esteem of such men of letters as Davenant and Waller, and even of Cowley, a member of the Royal Society.<sup>2</sup> On the whole, however, his disciples seem to have been more ready to talk than to write, and his great vogue is best apparent from the number, the seriousness, and the persistence of his opponents.

Hobbes fought indeed alone against all the leading thinkers of his time. Already in 1645 he had entered upon a long controversy with Bishop Bramhall on free-will and necessitarianism.<sup>3</sup> The Cambridge Platonists attacked from various points of view the "mechanic" philosophy of Hobbes. Of these the most important were Ralph Cudworth and Henry More, both of them members of the Royal Society and both declared adherents of the new science. More had said already in 1647 that "it is plain to any man that is not prejudic'd" that Galileo's "System of the world is more naturall & genuine than that of Tycho's."<sup>4</sup> Cudworth objected only to a materialistic interpretation of the new science. Imbued with the notion that truth is purest at its source in antiquity, he sought there for a truer philosophy. In his erudite work, *The True Intellectual System of the Universe* (1678), he distinguished between the ancient theistic and atheistic atomisms, the former of which he believed to be derived from Moses. From such heights of learning he felt himself able to weigh and estimate the atomistic science of his contemporaries, who were only reviving ancient doctrine, "and that with no small pomp and ostentation of wisdom and philosophy."

Though directing their polemics especially against Hobbes, both More and Cudworth, significantly, approved of Descartes, even

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 340. This story is told in a quite different manner by Sorbière: "Il a fait peur je ne sçay comment au Clergé de son pays, aux Mathematiciens d'Oxfordt, & à leurs adherants; c'est pourquoy S[a] M[a]jesté me le compara tres-bien à l'ours, contre lequel il fait battre les dogues pour les exercer" (*Relation d'un Voyage en Angleterre* [Cologne, 1666], p. 76).

<sup>2</sup> Cowley's ode to Hobbes was published before the Royal Society was founded, but there is nothing to indicate that he did not to the end continue to admire both the opposing parties.

<sup>3</sup> A controversy discussed and deservedly emphasized as "of great importance in the history of seventeenth-century thought" by Marjorie H. Nicolson, "Milton and Hobbes," *Studies in Philology*, XXIII (1926), 409.

<sup>4</sup> *Philosophical Poems* (Cambridge, 1647), p. 390.

though with some reservations. In the Preface to his treatise on *The Immortality of the Soul*, a treatise refuting Hobbes's doctrine that the soul is material,<sup>1</sup> More declares that he thinks

it is the most sober and faithful advice that can be offered to the Christian World, that they would encourage the reading of Des-Cartes in all publick Schools and Universities. That the Students of Philosophy may be thoroughly exercised in the just extent of the *Mechanical powers of Matter*, how farre they will reach, and where they fall short. Which will be the best assistance to Religion that Reason and the Knowledge of Nature can afford. For by this means such as are intended to serve the Church will be armed betimes with sufficient strength to grapple with their proudest Deriders or Opposers. Whenas for want of this, we see how liable they are to be contemned and born down by every bold, though weak, pretender to the *Mechanick Philosophy*.<sup>2</sup>

Cudworth gives Descartes the high praise of having revived the right kind, the theistic atomism of Moschus, whom Cudworth identified with Moses.

For *Renatus Cartesius* first revived and restored the atomick philosophy, agreeably, for the most part, to that ancient Moschical and Pythagorick form; acknowledging besides extended substance and corporeal atoms, another cogitative incorporeal substance, and joyning metaphysicks or theology, together with physiology, to make up one entire system of philosophy.

But he unreservedly condemns Hobbes, though not naming him:

But shortly after this *Cartesian* restitution of the primitive atomology, that acknowledgeth incorporeal substance, we have had our *Leucippus* and *Democritus* too, who also revived and brought upon the stage that other atheistick atomology, that makes *senseless and lifeless atoms to be the only principles of all things in the universe*; thereby necessarily excluding, besides incorporeal substance and immortality of souls, a Deity and natural morality; as also making all actions and events materially and mechanically necessary.<sup>3</sup>

These attempts to read Hobbes out of the new scientific movement did not, however, draw him into controversy, any more than did the sermons and pamphlets of "every young Churchman militant," who, as Warburton says, "would needs try his arms in thundering upon Hobbes' steel-cap." But the members of the Royal Society penetrated his armor, stirred him to counterattack, and in mathematics and physics won a whole series of easy victories, each of which

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* (London, 1662), chaps. viii-xii, pp. 34-49.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Preface.

<sup>3</sup> *True Intellectual System* (London, 1743), Book I, chap. iii, sec. 38, pp. 174-75.

seems to have left Hobbes more sore and obstinate than enlightened. He was indeed constantly on the wrong side of scientific questions; he was incompetent enough as a mathematician to try to demonstrate the quadrature of the circle; he rashly contradicted Boyle on the nature of the vacuum. Both as scientist and mathematician he had been discredited in discerning circles even before 1660.<sup>1</sup> It was his reputation and influence with the larger public that made a continued polemic against him necessary. The situation was especially delicate because the royal patron of the new science also showed a marked partiality for this charlatanical but dreaded enemy of the scientists.<sup>2</sup> And though dangerous as an enemy, Hobbes would have been far more insidiously dangerous as a friend and member of the Royal Society. The leaders of the new scientific movement could never have admitted the modern Democritus to their ranks without endangering their cause. Their most subtle and persistent difficulty was to explain to the public the difference between the Hobbists and the members of the Royal Society; to explain how these Christian scientists could accept the new philosophy of motion and yet escape an atheistic materialism.

### III

The Royal Society had of course enemies of all kinds. They alienated many churchmen and scholars by attacking the Aristotelian scholasticism which still dominated the universities. Here the Royal Society had to contend with a powerful vested interest, and they fought it vigorously and openly. But they suffered even more from the suspicion that they were undermining religion. Sprat, in his *History of the Royal Society* (1667), approaches this subject with the statement that it is "the weightiest and most solemn part of my whole undertaking; to make a defense of the *Royal Society*, and this new

<sup>1</sup> See the correspondence of Christian Huygens, in *Œuvres Complètes* (La Haye, 1888 ff.); especially the letters from Huygens to J. Wallis, March 15, 1656 (Vol. I, No. 272); and from Huygens to R. Moray, November 4, 1661 (Vol. III, No. 916): "Dans le Dialogue de Monsieur Hobbes je ne trouve rien de solide, mais seulement de pures visions. C'est par faute d'esprit ou par ce qu'il se plaît à contredire qu'il ne recoit pas les veritables raisons des effets du vide, qui sont dans le liure de Monsieur Bolle. Quand a ce qu'il adjouste de la duplication du cube, je ne l'ay pas voulu regarder par ce que je scay demonstration que la chose est impossible. Et d'ailleurs il y a long temps qu'en matiere de Geometrie Monsieur Hobbes a perdu tout credit aupres du moy."

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, letters from Moray to Huygens, September 13 and October 19, 1661 (Vol. III, Nos. 893 and 909). According to Sorbière, Charles II would have liked to have Hobbes elected to the Royal Society (*Relation* [ed. cit.], p. 75).

*Experimental Learning*, in respect to the *Christian Faith*. I am not ignorant, in what a slippery place I now stand; and what a tender matter I am enter'd upon."<sup>1</sup>

Sprat's discussion of the matter is eminently tactful, and also somewhat evasive. There is none of the direct attack on Hobbes found in More and Cudworth. The facts about the situation are more easily gathered from Boyle. This recognized great champion of both religion and science<sup>2</sup> was also one of the chief antagonists, along with Wallis and Ward, of Hobbes, to whom his references are frequent and explicit. In the Preface to *An Examen of Mr. T. Hobbes his Dialogus Physicus de Natura Aeris* (1662) he says he is writing to defend the experimental method which Hobbes scorned. He adds:

It was also suggested to me that the dangerous opinions about some important, if not fundamental, articles of religion, I had met with in his *Leviathan*, and some other of his writings, having made too great impressions upon divers persons, (who, though said to be for the most part either of greater quality, or of greater wit than learning, do yet divers of them deserve better principles,) these errors being chiefly recommended by the opinion they had of Mr. Hobbes's demonstrative way of philosophy; it might possibly prove some service to higher truths than those in controversy between him and me, to shew, that in the Physics themselves, his opinions, and even his ratiocinations, have no such great advantage over those, of some orthodox Christian Naturalists.<sup>3</sup>

In his *Usefulness of Natural Philosophy* (1663) he objects that it has long been the custom of such men [i.e., atheists], to talk, as if themselves, and those of their mind, were not alone the best, but almost the only naturalists; and to perplex others with pretending, that, whereas it is not conceivable, how there can be a God; all things are by the principles of the atomical philosophy, made clear and facil.<sup>4</sup>

In the second part of this work (1671) he says:

I forget not that there are several divines (and some of the eminent ones) that out of a holy jealousy (as they think) for religion, labour to deter men from addicting themselves to serious and thorough inquiries into nature, as

<sup>1</sup> *History* (ed. cit.), Part III, sec. xiv, p. 345.

<sup>2</sup> Stillington, in a letter of October 6, 1662, urged Boyle to publish his papers on behalf of Christianity against Hobbes. See Boyle, *Works*, V (1744), 516. See also letters from Peter du Moulin, December 28, 1669 (V, 594); from J. Beale, June 26, 1682 (V, 505); from Cudworth, October 16, 1684 (V, 549)—all indicative of the way Boyle was relied on to save the day.

<sup>3</sup> *Works*, I, 119.

<sup>4</sup> *Usefulness of Natural Philosophy*, Part I, Essay 5, in *Works*, I, 459.



from a study unsafe for a Christian, and likely to end in atheism, by making it possible for men (that I may propose to you their objection as much to its advantage as I can) to give themselves such an account of all the wonders of nature, by the single knowledge of second causes, as may bring them to disbelieve the necessity of a first.<sup>1</sup>

In 1675 Boyle writes that whereas atheists had formerly been in the habit of attacking the historical and doctrinal parts of Christian theology, they in this age attacked the very notion of God and religion. "For these libertines own themselves to be so upon the account of the Epicurean, and other mechanical principles of philosophy"; and, he adds, they recognize no authorities except such as "Leucippus, Democritus, Epicurus, &c.," who "explicate things by matter and local motion."<sup>2</sup> "*The modern Atheists*," wrote Rev. Joseph Glanvill, another member of the Royal Society, "are pretenders to the *mechanick* principles . . . the *modern Sadduce* pretends that all things we do, are performed by *meer matter*, and *motion*, and consequently that there is no such thing as an *immaterial* being."<sup>3</sup> Obviously, the scientists of the Royal Society, even though they themselves may have been secure from the charge of atheism, could hardly escape the charge of cultivating a philosophy which led to atheism in others. How did they defend themselves against this charge?

Officially they did nothing. Officially the Royal Society, as Sprat says, "is abundantly cautious, not to intermeddle in *Spiritual things*," and such subjects as God and the soul were not discussed at their meetings.<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless, there was considerable unanimity of opinion among the members. It is well known that Descartes was respected

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 429-30. Meric Casaubon, no friend to the new science, had expressed this objection in *A Letter . . . to Peter du Moulin . . . Concerning Natural experimental Philosophie, and some books lately set out about it* (Cambridge, 1669). After a lengthy attack on the presumption of the new science, he continues (p. 30): "Now I crave leave to tell you, that it is (as all good things, more or less) very apt to be abused and to degenerate into *Atheism*. Men that are much fixed upon matter and secondary causes and sensual objects, if great care be not taken, may in time, (there be many examples) and by degrees forget that there be such things in the world as *Spirits*, substances really existing and of great power, though not visible, or palpable by their nature; forget I say, that there is a God, and that their souls are immortal." In this same year Dr. du Moulin, who was like Casaubon a prebendary of Canterbury, saw his Latin poem in praise of the Royal Society suppressed by the licenser, Dr. Gunning, later Bishop of Ely. See Boyle's *Works*, I, 60, and V, 594.

<sup>2</sup> Preface to *Some Considerations about the Reconcilableness of Reason and Religion* (ed. cit.), III, 510.

<sup>3</sup> *Philosophia Pia* (1671), pp. 23, 32.

<sup>4</sup> *History* (ed. cit.), Part III, sec. xiv, and Part II, sec. xi, pp. 83 and 347.



by them as a philosophical as well as a scientific genius. Through the Royal Society as well as through the Cambridge Platonists, Cartesianism became a very important element in English idealistic thought in that century. But the members of the Royal Society adopted also another mode of defense against materialism, namely, a critique of the very science they were promoting, a critique which varied all the way from timidity in generalization to philosophical skepticism.

Sprat testifies to the extreme caution of the Society from its very inception. Their motto *Nullius in Verba* was a hit at the tyranny of scholasticism, but it soon became apparent that the tyranny of Epicurus or Democritus, or of any "modern dogmatists," would be equally unwelcome.<sup>1</sup> In fact, no philosopher was accorded the seat of authority, not even Descartes. Companies, Sprat says repeatedly, are to be preferred before single endeavors in philosophical matters, as "exhibiting more wariness, and coldness in thinking, and rigorous examination." Altogether Sprat fears that "to this fault of *Sceptical doubting*, the *Royal Society* may perhaps be suspected, to be a little too much inclin'd: because they always professed, to be so backward from *setting of Principles*, or *fixing upon Doctrines*." To which Sprat replies that generalizing is for the future, and in the mean time dogmatism is more dangerous than skepticism.<sup>2</sup>

Among the workers in the Royal Society, no one was more wary and cold in scientific thinking, more reluctant to dogmatize from the new science, than Robert Boyle. It is therefore particularly important to note that he cultivated this critical, not to say skeptical, attitude toward science with a conscious intent to serve religion. In his *Excellence of Theology* (1673), Part II, section 3, he criticizes the belief that physics has one prerogative over divinity, namely, "the certainty, and clearness, and thence resulting satisfactoriness of our knowledge of physical, in comparison of any we can have of theological matters, whose being dark and uncertain, the nature of the things themselves, and the numerous controversies of differing sects about them, sufficiently manifest." In reply Boyle does not urge the certainty of divinity, but the real uncertainty of science.

That physical certainty, [he says] which is pretended for the truths demonstrated by naturalists, is, even where it is rightfully claimed, but an inferior

<sup>1</sup> *History* (ed. cit.), Part I, secs. xiii-xv, pp. 28-35.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 100-109.

kind or degree of certainty, as moral certainty also is. For even physical demonstrations can beget but a physical certainty, (that is, a certainty upon supposition, that the principles of physic be true,) not a metaphysical certainty, (wherein it is absolutely impossible, that the thing believed should be other than true). . . . And there are I know not how many things in physicks, that men presume they believe upon physical and cogent arguments, wherein they really have but a moral assurance; which is a truth held by so few, that I have been invited to take the more particular notice of them in other papers, written purposely to show the doubtfulness and incompleteness of natural philosophy; . . . the most even of the modern virtuosi are wont to fancy more of clearness and certainty in their physical theories, than a critical examiner will find.<sup>1</sup>

Boyle, then, sought a reconciliation of the new science with religion by limiting the sphere of reason; he weakened the materialistic interpretation of the new science by emphasizing the uncertainty of science itself.

This criticism of scientific knowledge was carried still further by Joseph Glanvill, whose volume, *The Vanity of Dogmatizing* (1661), was reprinted in 1664 as *Sceptis scientifica*, with a Dedication to the Royal Society which resulted in his election to membership.<sup>2</sup> A passage from this Dedication will explain his purpose and its relation to Hobbes as well as to the new science. The work of the Royal Society, he says, is

the improving the minds of Men in solid and useful notices of things, helping them to such theories as may be serviceable to common life, and the searching out of the true laws of Matter and Motion, in order to the securing of the Foundations of Religion against all attempts of Mechanical Atheism.

For the ingenious World being grown quite weary of Qualities and Formes, and declaring in favour of the Mechanical Hypothesis, (to which a person that is not very fond of Religion is a great pretender) divers of the brisker Geniuses, who desire rather to be accounted Witts, then endeavour to be so, have been willing to accept Mechanism upon Hobbian conditions, and many others were in danger of following them into the precipice. So that 'tis not

<sup>1</sup> *Works* (ed. cit.), III, 432. Cf. Burtt, *op. cit.*, pp. 178-82, and Whitehead's discussion of modern science as "predominantly an anti-rationalistic movement" (p. 23). Although passages from Boyle could be patched together to make a criticism of human knowledge almost as complete as that of Glanvill, yet Nourisson has undoubtedly exaggerated his skepticism in his essay in *Philosophies de la Nature* (Paris, 1887), pp. 43-84.

<sup>2</sup> On December 7, 1664, "Lord Brereton presented a book written by J. Glanvill, dedicated to the Society, the dedication of which was read. Mr. Glanvill was proposed candidate by Lord Brereton" (Birch, *History of the Royal Society*, p. 500). Glanvill was elected and admitted December 14, 1664. *Sceptis scientifica* was licensed for publication on October 18, 1664.

conceivable how a more suitable remedy could have been provided against the deadly influence of that Contagion, then your Honourable Society, by which the meanest intellects may perceive, that Mechanick Philosophy yields no security to irreligion, and that those that would be gently learned and ingenious, need not purchase it, at the dear rate of being atheists.

It is impossible and unnecessary here to examine in detail the skepticism of Glanvill. We are concerned more with the occasion of his thought than with an evaluation of it. It must suffice to say that Glanvill has a place in the history of philosophy as an acute and ingenious thinker, whose critique of causation anticipates in some respects that of Hume himself. These scientific skeptics were, indeed, not naïve theorizers; they were versed in the tradition of philosophical skepticism. Boyle knew the work of Sextus Empiricus,<sup>1</sup> and Glanvill shows an acquaintance not only with Sextus, but with such modern disciples as Montaigne and Charron.<sup>2</sup> Perhaps they were also indebted to Sir Thomas Browne, although his imaginative flights and complete humiliation of the reason must have appeared to them rather too uncritical. And yet Glanvill conveyed, in rhythms that recall Browne, a sense of the mystery of the world both in its vastness and in its infinite minuteness, and of the miracle of man among all these unexplainable wonders:

Whatever I look upon within the amplitude of heaven and earth, is evidence of humane ignorance; For all things are a great darkness to us, and we are so unto our selves: The plainest things are as obscure, as the most confessedly mysterious; and the Plants we tread on, are as much above us, as the Stars and Heavens. The things that touch us are as distant from us, as the Pole; and we are as much strangers to our selves, as to the inhabitants of America.<sup>3</sup>

Both Glanvill and Boyle, however, refused to be identified with the extreme skeptical position that truth is unknowable.<sup>4</sup> They were far from intending to discourage scientific and philosophic activity. But they believed that he is least likely to go astray who is most keenly

<sup>1</sup> See reference in *A Free Inquiry into the received Notion of Nature*, printed in 1686, but written about 1666 (*Works* [ed. cit.], IV, 376 and 359).

<sup>2</sup> Ferris Greenslet, *Joseph Glanvill* (New York, 1900), pp. 95 ff. For references to Montaigne and Charron, see *Scepsis scientifica*, pp. 114 and 172.

<sup>3</sup> From "Address to the Royal Society," *Scepsis scientifica*.

<sup>4</sup> Boyle, ed. cit., I, 374; and Glanvill, *Scire, or Reply to Albius* (1665), p. 3.

aware of the weakness and deception of human faculties. And in "Hobbism" they saw the grand modern illustration of stiff confidence in opinion, of the vanity of dogmatizing.<sup>1</sup>

IV

It is now possible to return to Dryden and ask whether he was aware of the developments we have sketched. We should the more expect their influence to be noticeable because they came so largely in the period from 1660 to 1680, the very years when Dryden was equipping himself with those ideas which make his political and religious poems, as a group, a remarkable expression of the conservative temperament. *Religio Laici* and *The Hind and the Panther* constitute the *terminus ad quem* in a study of Dryden's intellectual history.<sup>2</sup> But for material on his development up to 1680 we have to depend quite largely on his dramas.

A valuable clue is given us in the notes collected in 1679-80 by John Aubrey toward a life of Hobbes: "Mr. John Dreyden, Poet Laureat, is his great admirer, and oftentimes makes use of his doctrine in his plays—from Mr. Dreyden himself."<sup>3</sup> And although Aubrey was too enthusiastic a friend of Hobbes to be trusted in all matters, yet this note can hardly be without foundation. Its authoritative source is confirmed by the many parallels to the doctrines of Hobbes to be found in Dryden's plays. In political thought, for instance, the monarchical absolutism of Hobbes is also the doctrine of

<sup>1</sup> The skeptical attitude toward science was not without influence. In 1688 Matthew Prior, then at St. John's College, Cambridge, wrote a grandiose ode *On Exod. III. 14.*—*I Am That I Am*, the theme of which is the inadequacy of reason to understand the world and the necessity of exercising faith and reverence to reach the high abode of the mysterious God who revealed himself to Moses. A few lines will show how definitely Prior applied his critique to materialistic science:

"Man does with dangerous curiosity  
These unfathom'd wonders try:  
With fancied rules and arbitrary laws  
Matter and motion he restrains;  
And studied lines and fictitious circles draws:  
Then with imagin'd sovereignty  
Lord of his new hypothesis he reigns."

(Prior, *Poetical Works* [ed. R. B. Johnson; London, 1907], I, 23-27.) The *scopsis scientifica* has again become a familiar and important conception in the discussions of the present century, as, for instance, in Émile Boutroux, "La Religion et les limites de la science," *Science et religion* (Paris, 1908).

<sup>2</sup> To supplement and complete the present study, the writer is preparing parallel discussions of Dryden's relation to the political and religious controversies of his time.

<sup>3</sup> *Brief Lives*, I, 372. For the date of the notes see Introduction, p. 16.

Dryden's stage creatures,<sup>1</sup> and must have been particularly grateful to the ears of the court audience for which Dryden wrote. And yet this resemblance alone would not be decisive proof of indebtedness; a narrow political outlook was almost inevitable in heroic drama, and is common enough in the plays of Orrery, for instance, who has hardly been suspected of an admiration for Hobbes. More conclusive, I believe, and for the purpose of this study, more important, is the frequent reference in Dryden to the dilemma of free-will and necessity—the great ethical problem raised in a new form by Hobbism. In 1664, in his Dedication of *The Rival Ladies* to Lord Orrery, he implies that free-will is a delusion:

Here [in Orrery's plays] is no chance, which you have not foreseen; all your heroes are more than your subjects, they are your creatures; and though they seem to move freely in all the sallies of their passions, yet you make destinies for them, which they cannot shun. They are moved (if I may dare to say so) like the rational creatures of the Almighty Poet, who walk at liberty, in their own opinion, because their fetters are invisible; when, indeed, the prison of their will is the more sure for being large; and, instead of an absolute power over their actions, they have only a wretched desire of doing that, which they cannot choose but do.<sup>2</sup>

Almanzor, the hero of *The Conquest of Granada* (1670), is troubled by the same problem:

O Heaven, how dark a riddle's thy decree,  
Which bounds our wills, yet seems to leave them free!  
Since thy fore-knowledge cannot be in vain,  
Our choice must be what thou didst first ordain.  
Thus, like a captive in an isle confined,  
Man walks at large, a prisoner of the mind:  
Wills all his crimes, while Heaven the indictment draws,  
And, pleading guilty, justifies the laws.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Merritt Y. Hughes has pointed out parallels in his article, "Dryden as Statist," *Philological Quarterly*, VI (1927), 334-50; but Mr. Hughes relied only on internal evidence, without noting either the remark of Aubrey or the contemporary accusation that Dryden got his political ideas from Hobbes, in *Censure of the Rota* (see Mark Van Doren, *The Poetry of John Dryden* [New York, 1920], p. 21).

<sup>2</sup> *Works* (ed. cit.), II, 132-33.

<sup>3</sup> *Conquest of Granada*, Part II, Act IV, sc. iii (*Works*, IV, 190-91).

A sufficient number of such allusions can be found before 1680 to indicate that Dryden was interested in the subject.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps the most surprising expression of determinism is in *The State of Innocence* (1674), his operatic version of *Paradise Lost*, a philosophical perversion of the epic to which it is hard to believe Milton would have given his consent. In the opera the newly created Adam seems to have an innate understanding of seventeenth-century philosophy. When he first becomes conscious, he rises and speaks as a Cartesian:

What am I? or from whence? For that I am  
I know, because I think, etc.<sup>2</sup>

But when Gabriel and Raphael are sent down jointly to instruct Adam in the doctrine of the freedom of the will, they find him a most reluctant and obstinate scholar.

GABRIEL: The Eternal, when he did the world create,  
All other agents did necessitate:  
So what he ordered, they by nature do:  
Thus light things mount, and heavy downward go.  
Man only boasts an arbitrary state.

ADAM: Yet causes their effects necessitate  
In willing agents; where is freedom then?  
Or who can break the chain which limits men  
To act what is unchangeably forecast,  
Since the first cause gives motion to the last?

The lengthy discussion appears to have been unsuccessful, for after his instructors have departed Adam is still lamenting his "hard state of life" in the divine disposition which has been explained to him.<sup>3</sup> These pages of argument read like a brief summary of the famous

<sup>1</sup> I have collected the following, with references to the Scott and Saintsbury edition:

*Indian Queen* (1664), Act II, sc. iii (II, 246)  
*Indian Queen* (1664), Act III, sc. ii (II, 257)  
*The Tempest* (1667), Act III, sc. v (III, 175)  
*Tyrannic Love* (1669), Act I, sc. i (III, 389)  
*Tyrannic Love* (1669), Act III, sc. i (III, 410)  
*Tyrannic Love* (1669), Act IV, sc. i (III, 430)  
*Conquest of Granada, Part I* (1670), Act II, sc. i (IV, 56-57)  
*Conquest of Granada, Part II* (1670), Act III, sc. i (IV, 162)

In the Dedication to *Aurung-Zebe* (1676) there is an interesting passage: "Our minds are perpetually wrought on by the temperament of our bodies; which makes me suspect, they are nearer allied, than our philosophers or school-divines will allow them to be."

<sup>2</sup> *State of Innocence*, Act II, sc. i (V, 133-34).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Act IV, sc. i (*Works*, V, 152-56).

Bramhall-Hobbes controversy, with Adam, despite his innocence, taking the part of Hobbes.

But it would be a mistake to rush, from such passages and from Aubrey's note, to the conclusion that Dryden was at this time a disciple of Hobbes, any more than of Descartes. He must have been interested in necessitarianism, speculated on its implications, and enjoyed testing out its argumentative strength in verse. Sympathetic intellectual curiosity is one of Dryden's marked characteristics. But this very suppleness of his mind served also to liberate him from the dogmatism and egotism of Hobbes. In his old age he spoke of Hobbes's translation of Homer as "bald," adding that he studied "poetry as he did mathematics, when it was too late."<sup>1</sup> It was a curt dismissal. In 1685, in a discussion of himself as translator of Lucretius, he incidentally clearly draws the distinction between himself and Hobbes, both in temperament and ideas:

If I am not mistaken, the distinguishing character of Lucretius (I mean of his soul and genius) is a certain kind of noble pride, and positive assertion of his opinions. He is everywhere confident of his own reason, and assuming an absolute command, not only over his vulgar reader, but even his patron Memmius. For he is always bidding him attend, as if he had the rod over him, as our poet and philosopher of Malmesbury. This is that perpetual dictatorship, which is exercised by Lucretius; who, though often in the wrong, yet seems to deal *bona fide* with his reader, and tells him nothing but what he thinks; in which plain sincerity, I believe, he differs from our Hobbes, who could not but be convinced, or at least doubt, of some eternal truths, which he had opposed. . . . For there is no doubt to be made, but that he [Lucretius] could have been everywhere as poetical, as he is in his descriptions, and in the moral part of his philosophy, if he had not aimed more to instruct, in his System of Nature, than to delight. But he was bent upon making Memmius a materialist, and teaching him to defy an invisible power: in short, he was so much an atheist, that he forgot sometimes to be a poet. These are the considerations, which I had of that author, before I attempted to translate some parts of him. And accordingly I laid by my natural diffidence and scepticism for a while, to take up that dogmatical way of his, which, as I said, is so much his character, as to make him that individual poet.<sup>2</sup>

These passages, it is true, come too late in Dryden's life to constitute alone any sure indication of his attitude toward Hobbes before 1680. But when they are considered along with his earlier comments on the new science, the Royal Society, and his own distrust of

<sup>1</sup> *Preface to the Fables* (1700), in *Essays* (ed. W. P. Ker), II, 252.

<sup>2</sup> *Preface to Sylva* (1685) (*Essays*, I, 259-60).



dogmatism, they lose their casual appearance; and the impression grows that Dryden's attitude toward Hobbes must from the beginning have involved reservations and that he found himself more naturally on the side of the Royal Society, with its eminent spokesmen Boyle and Glanvill.<sup>1</sup>

V

There can be no doubt of Dryden's real appreciation of the new science. In an *Epistle to Dr. Charlton*, written in 1662, he praises English science, especially Bacon, Gilbert, Boyle, and Harvey. There is the famous apostrophe to the Royal Society in *Annus Mirabilis*, in which, after prophesying remarkable progress in navigation, he adds:

This I foretell, from your auspicious care  
Who great in search of God and nature grow;  
Who best your wise Creator's praise declare,  
Since best to praise His works is best to know.

Even more direct and forceful are two passages, heretofore strangely neglected, in the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* (1668). One is a recognition of the remarkable scientific advance after Copernicus:

Is it not evident [asks Crites, who is otherwise on the side of the Ancients] in these last hundred years (when the study of philosophy has been the business of all the Virtuosi in Christendom), that almost a new Nature has been revealed to us?—that more errors of the school have been detected, more useful experiments in philosophy have been made, more noble secrets in optics, medicine, anatomy, astronomy, discovered, than in all those credulous and doting ages from Aristotle to us?—so true it is, that nothing spreads more fast than science, when rightly and generally cultivated.<sup>2</sup>

Later in the same essay he makes Lisideius allude to "what the philosophers say of motion that, when it is once begun, it continues

<sup>1</sup> A very interesting passage in the *Essay on Heroic Plays* (1672) by no means implies discipleship: "I dare further affirm, that the whole doctrine of separated beings, whether those spirits are incorporeal substances (which Mr. Hobbes, with some reason, thinks to imply a contradiction), or that they are a thinner or more aerial sort of bodies (as some of the Fathers have conjectured), may better be explicated by poets than by philosophers or divines. For their speculations on this subject are wholly poetical; they have only their fancy for their guide; and that, being sharper in an excellent poet, than it is likely it should in a phlegmatic, heavy gownman, will see farther in its own empire, and produce more satisfactory notions on those dark and doubtful problems" (*Essays* [ed. Ker], I, 153). A man who held such theories of knowledge and psychology would certainly never have been recognized by Hobbes as a hopeful disciple. Dryden had a very un-Hobbesian interest in the realms of mystery, and he repeatedly defended the use of the supernatural in epic poetry.

<sup>2</sup> *Essays* (ed. Ker), I, 36-37.

of itself, and will do so to eternity, without some stop put to it"<sup>1</sup>—which is a simple statement of what was later to become Newton's first law of motion.

But we can go even further. That "natural diffidence and skepticism" which Dryden in 1685 declared part of his character, he already in 1668 identified with the skeptical attitude of the Royal Society. When his brother-in-law, Sir Robert Howard, charged him with being "magisterial" in the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, his reply was that

in vindication of myself, I must crave leave to say, that my whole discourse was sceptical, according to that way of reasoning which was used by Socrates, Plato, and all the Academies of old, which Tully and the best of the Ancients followed, and which is imitated by the modest inquisitions of the Royal Society. That it is so, not only the name will show, which is *an Essay*, but the frame and composition of the work. You see it is a dialogue sustained by persons of several opinions, all of them left doubtful, to be determined by the readers in general.<sup>2</sup>

In the true spirit of the Royal Society he asks, in the Preface to *An Evening's Love* (1671), "why should there be any *Ipse dixit* in our poetry, any more than there is in our philosophy?"<sup>3</sup>

That skepticism which separated Dryden from Hobbes and Lucretius was therefore no passing whim; it was both an early and a permanent intellectual characteristic. In the Preface to *Religio Laici* (1682) he confesses that he was "naturally inclined to scepticism in philosophy." He criticizes the Deists, and even some leaders in the Anglican church, for their confidence in religious rationalism. He says:

Our modern philosophers, nay, and some of our philosophizing divines have too much exalted the faculties of our souls, when they have maintained that by their force mankind has been able to find that there is one supreme agent or intellectual Being which we call God. . . . They who would prove religion by reason, do but weaken the cause which they endeavour to support: 'tis to take away the pillars from our faith, and to prop it only with a twig.

It was this distrust of reason, this philosophical skepticism, that drove Dryden toward conservatism and authority in religion, and ultimately to the Catholic church, just as his distrust of the populace was one reason for his increasing conservatism and Toryism in politics.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 63.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 124.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 138. Cf. also *Defence of the Epilogue* (1672), I, 163.

VI

On such evidence the case must rest. Fragmentary and meager as it is, it would at least seem sufficient to indicate that Dryden was not unresponsive to the intellectual impulses aroused by the new scientific movement. All that we know of Dryden's intellectual character, his sensitiveness to all winds of doctrine, his curiosity, his wide and sympathetic interests, should in fact have led us to expect just such a conclusion. Few poets have consciously cultivated so many contacts with the world as Dryden. He wrote in 1674:

Mere poets and mere musicians are as sottish as mere drunkards are, who live in a continual mist, without seeing or judging anything clearly. A man should be learned in several sciences, and should have a reasonable, philosophical, and in some measure a mathematical head, to be a complete and excellent poet; and besides this, should have experience in all sorts of humours and manners of men.<sup>1</sup>

Again, in 1679, in his Preface to *Troilus and Cressida*, he says that the "manners" are to "be gathered from the several virtues, vices, or passions, and many other commonplaces, which a poet must be supposed to have learned from natural Philosophy, Ethics, and History; of all which, whosoever is ignorant, does not deserve the name of poet."<sup>2</sup> Dryden proves so baffling because, with a multiplicity of ideas, he appears to have no system; he incorporates ideas, often contradictory ones, into his writings with an eye more to their rhetorical than their philosophical value. Carneades, one of the most famous of Greek skeptics, appeared before the Roman Senate on two successive days, and shocked the moral sense of that venerable assembly by brilliantly attacking the second day all that he had brilliantly defended on the first; skepticism offers peculiar advantages to the artist in expression. Dryden loved reasoning in verse so well that he could not resist an opportunity for a debate, whether in a play or a poem; and he lent of his fire and strength to both sides. But in spite of this inclusiveness of Dryden's intellectual interests, there is a consistency of temperament in his work which allies him with certain tendencies and groups of his time more than with others. It is the problem of

<sup>1</sup> Postscript to *Notes and Observations on the Empress of Morocco*, in *Works* (ed. Scott and Saintsbury), XV, 406.

<sup>2</sup> *E-ssays* (ed. Ker), I, 214.

criticism to find the perspective from which this larger consistency becomes apparent.

Since the material is so meager for even a descriptive study of Dryden's mind, it would be rash, at least in the present state of Dryden scholarship, to make any large assertions regarding the genesis of his ideas. It is not contended here that Dryden was a skeptic because he was a member of the Royal Society and knew Boyle and Glanvill; skepticism could in that age be acquired in many ways. The purpose of this study is to emphasize the significance and representative nature of Dryden's mind. His ideas are closely related to the important movements of his age. He was interested in the Royal Society, understood its spirit, and recognized that he was like minded with it; he understood the new philosophy of motion, vaguely perhaps in its scientific aspects, but with an acute interest in its deterministic implications regarding human nature; and he rejected the dogmatic materialism of Hobbes and Lucretius. And when we look for the meaning and importance of his distrust of the reason in *Religio laici* and *The Hind and the Panther*, or for the interpretation of his ingenuous changeableness in literary opinions, we must go, among other places, to his intellectual experiences with the new science, with Hobbes, and with the Royal Society.

LOUIS I. BREDVOLD

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

## THOMSON AND THE COUNTESS OF HERTFORD

To rescue a literary lady from the unmerited disparagement of Dr. Johnson is a pleasant privilege even after many years. Of the lady who gave hospitable encouragement to the early efforts of the author of *The Seasons*, comparatively little that is trustworthy has been written. History has been content to refer to her as "the patroness of Thomson"; to mention that to her the poet dedicated his *Spring*; and then to repeat the anecdote from Johnson's *Life of Thomson*. The Doctor wrote:

Spring was published next year [1728], with a dedication to the Countess of Hertford; whose practice it was to invite every summer some poet into the country, to hear her verses and assist her studies. This honor was one summer conferred on Thomson, who took more delight in carousing with Lord Hertford and his friends than assisting her ladyship's poetical operations, and therefore never received another summons.<sup>1</sup>

Interpretation of this anecdote worked, strangely enough, more to the disadvantage of the lady than of the poet, notably in the essay of the Earl of Buchan in 1792. The poet's irascible Scotch apologist wrote:

That no earl or countess ever gave Johnson an invitation to the country can excite no wonder, nor that Thomson's genius and independent spirit should lead him to prefer wit and the social board of an accomplished family, to the manufacture of courtly verses, for a verse-sick countess.<sup>2</sup>

"Courtly verses" is as far from an appropriate description of the compositions of Lady Hertford's rural muse as "verse-sick countess" is descriptive of the lady herself, who, Walpole declared (with un-

<sup>1</sup> First published in Johnson's *Lives of the Poets* in 1781. Part of the material concerning Thomson's earlier years Boswell gathered for Johnson in Scotland. He complains of Johnson's failure to correct one mistake of earlier biographers in regard to Thomson's mother's maiden name: "Dr. Johnson was by no means attentive to minute accuracy in his *Lives of the Poets*; for notwithstanding my having detected this mistake, he has continued it" (*Life of Johnson* [Oxford University Press, 1924], II, 271).

<sup>2</sup> Earl of Buchan, *Essays on the Lives and Writings of Fletcher of Saltoun and the Poet Thomson: Biographical, Critical, and Political* (London, 1792), p. 258.

wonted generosity), had "as much taste for the writings of others as modesty about her own."<sup>1</sup>

Johnson's authority for the story of Thomson's conduct to his patroness, and the consequent break in their relations, has been only mildly questioned. Successive biographers of the poet repeated the anecdote; and biographers of the Countess of Hertford, from the early editor of her letters<sup>2</sup> to the modern annalists of the House of Percy,<sup>3</sup> have shown little disposition to clear her reputation of this mild indignity. One may suspect that the story originated with Savage, who was associated with Thomson during the years in question.<sup>4</sup> On Savage's assertion Johnson admittedly based other statements in his *Life of Thomson*.<sup>5</sup> Was it through Thomson, on the other hand, that word of Savage's disastrous plight reached the sympathetic countess and led to that appeal to Queen Caroline which saved the unfortunate man's life?<sup>6</sup>

Certain doubters of the Doctor's accuracy did arise. Sir Harry Nicholas in his *Memoir*, first published in 1831 in the Aldine edition of Thomson's poetical works, recalling the solicitude at the time of Thomson's death which Lady Hertford expressed in letters to Lady Luxborough and to Shenstone, declares: "These passages prove her Grace's respect for his memory, and render Johnson's remark, that he displeased her, unlikely."<sup>7</sup> Mr. G. C. Macaulay, in his life of Thomson, is likewise mildly incredulous, but seems to echo the words of Nicholas. Quoting Johnson, Mr. Macaulay adds: "It may be so; but Lady Hertford did not lose interest in him [Thomson], for a letter of later date is extant, in which she enthusiastically praises his work."<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Horace Walpole, *A Catalogue of the Royal and Noble Authors of England*, . . . Second Edition (London, 1759), II, 200. John Duncombe in his *Feminead; or Female Genius* (1751) also celebrated Lady Hertford in the laborious eulogy:

"Here, sweetly blended, to our wond'ring eyes,  
The Peeress, Poetess and Christian rise;  
And tho' the Nine her tuneful strains inspire,  
We less her genius than her heart admire."

<sup>2</sup> William Bingley, *Correspondence between Frances Countess of Hartford, and Henrietta Louisa, Countess of Pomfret* (London, 1806), I, vii-viii.

<sup>3</sup> Gerald Brennan, *A History of the House of Percy* (ed. W. A. Lindsay; London, 1902), II, 422.

<sup>4</sup> Thomson met Savage at Aaron Hill's on April 26, 1726. See *Poetical Works of James Thomson* (Aldine ed.; London: Pickering, 1847), I, xxviii.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. xiv.

<sup>6</sup> Shell's account of this incident emphasizes a little more than Johnson's the virtue of the countess "who engaged in his [Thomson's] support with the tenderness and humanity particular to that amiable lady" (*The Lives of the Poets . . . By Mr. Cibber and other Hands* London, 1753), V, 44).

<sup>7</sup> *Poetical Works* (Aldine ed., 1747), I, vi. See *infra*, p. 33.

<sup>8</sup> G. C. Macaulay, *James Thomson*, "English Men of Letters Series" (London, 1908), p. 23.

Finally, Mr. J. Logie Robertson, in his notes to the Oxford edition of Thomson's poetical works, declares, after rehearsing Johnson's anecdote:

It is extremely probable, however, that Thomson wrote part of *Spring* at Marlborough Castle, in Wiltshire, the seat of the Earl of Hertford; and it is certain that as a poet he retained the respect and regard of the Countess as long as he lived. In 1748 we find her generously recommending to one of her friends the poem of that year—"Mr. Thomson's *Castle of Indolence*."<sup>1</sup>

All three skeptics, it should be noted, refer to Lady Hertford's letters of the year 1748.

Recent examination of certain papers of the Percy family at Alnwick Castle (an investigation which I was privileged to make through the very great kindness of the Duke of Northumberland) has discovered abundant evidence of the continued interest of the Countess in Thomson, and of some measure of friendly intercourse between them from 1727 until Thomson's death in 1748. The traces of this relationship throw a little light on Thomson's life and his reputation, and contribute to our knowledge of an eighteenth-century lady of modest but genuine literary gifts, and intellectual enthusiasms of a romantic order shared with a notable circle of friends. Among her correspondents Lady Hertford numbered Lady Winchilsea, Lady Pomfret, Lady Luxborough (the half-sister of Bolingbroke), Mrs. Carter, Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe, Miss Talbot, Selina, Countess of Huntingdon, Isaac Watts, Gilbert Burnet, and others less known to fame; not to mention the poets for whom she served as friendly patroness—Thomson, Stephen Duck, and Shenstone in particular. The private letters of this group<sup>2</sup> display the vitality of that "enthusiasm" so deprecated by their neo-classical contemporaries.

The granddaughter of that first Viscount Weymouth of Longleat, who befriended Bishop Ken—see the charming poems entitled *Lyra Innocentium* which the bishop wrote for his host's little granddaughters "Molly" and "Fan"<sup>3</sup>—Frances Thynne spent much of her childhood amid the quiet beauty of her grandfather's estate. In 1715,

<sup>1</sup> *The Complete Poetical Works of James Thomson* (Oxford ed.; ed. J. Logie Robertson; Oxford, 1908), p. 48. See also William Bague, *James Thomson* (Edinburgh and London, 1898), pp. 65-66.

<sup>2</sup> Lady Hertford's circle includes several members of the "Warwickshire Coterie." See W. H. Hutton, *Burford Papers* (London, 1905), pp. 153-90; and W. H. Hutton in the *Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit.*, Vol. X, chap. xi, sec. II.

<sup>3</sup> E. H. Plumptre, *The Life of Thomas Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells* (London, 1889), II, 178.



when barely sixteen, she married Algernon Seymour, Earl of Hertford, son of the sixth Duke of Somerset, "the Proud Duke," who was so powerful a figure at the courts of Queen Anne and George I; and son also of Elizabeth Percy of romantic history, through whom he inherited the Percy baronies. After her marriage the young bride entered immediately upon the social life of London and the Court of St. James's. In 1716 her first child was born, Lady Elizabeth Seymour, who became the first Duchess of Northumberland, the "Lady Betty" of her mother's letters; and in 1725 the son, George Lord Beauchamp, whose death of smallpox while traveling in Italy with his tutor in 1744 cast a lasting shadow over his mother's spirit. In 1723 Lady Hertford was appointed Lady of the Bedchamber to the Princess Caroline, and served that princess and queen until her death in 1737.<sup>1</sup> Lady Hertford herself died in 1754.

Through all these years when the demands of court life taxed her limited strength and vexed her sensitive spirit, Lady Hertford was happiest when, escaping from her house in Grosvenor Street, she withdrew to the seat of the Seymours at Marlborough Castle, or to a more modest residence at St. Leonard's Hill in Windsor Forest. In 1739 Lord Hertford purchased from Lord Bathurst his *extravagante bergerie*, as Pope called it, at Richkings near Colnbrook, rechristened Percy Lodge; here Lady Hertford spent all her later years. In such rural retreats, in her beloved gardens, her grotto, and her "closet," withdrawn from society other than that of the family to whom she was devoted and the close friends upon whom she lavished a generous affection, her time freed for reading, pious meditations, and for the writing of many letters, the Countess of Hertford really expressed herself. A lover of natural beauty and an eager seeker after the peace which, like many contemporary poets, she looked for in retirement, she extended prompt and hospitable encouragement to the genius of any who seemed to share her tastes.<sup>2</sup>

According to his biographers, Thomson first won the notice of the Countess of Hertford with the publication of *Winter* in 1726. "From

<sup>1</sup> The facts of this biographical sketch are derived from family papers at Alnwick Castle which correct certain vague or erroneous statements of early biographers, e.g., in regard to the dates of her birth, her marriage, and of her appointment as maid of honor.

<sup>2</sup> On the poetic expression of pleasure in retirement and solitude in this period see Dr. Amy L. Reed's dissertation, *The Background of Gray's Elegy* (Columbia University Press, 1924).

that time," writes Murdock, in his memoir, prefixed to the 1762 edition of the poet's works, "Mr. Thomson's acquaintance was courted by all men of taste; and several ladies of high rank and distinction became his declared patronesses; the Countess of Hartford, Miss Drelincourt, afterwards Viscountess Primrose, Mrs. Stanley, and others."

Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe writes Lady Hertford at this time: "There is a Poem in blank verse lately printed call'd Winter by Mr. Thomson. 'tis very fine so I am perswaded will please the Justice of your taste. I must copy this discription:

The year yet pleasing but declining fast  
Soft, o'er the secret Soul, in gentle Gales,  
A Philosophic Melancholly breathes,  
And bears the swelling Thought aloft to Heaven.  
Then forming Fancy rouses to conceive,  
What never mingled with the Vulgar's dream:  
Then wake the tender Pang, the pitying Tear,  
The Sigh for suffering Worth, the Wish prefer'd  
For Humankind, the Joy to see them bless'd,  
And all the Social Off-Spring of the Heart!"<sup>1</sup>

That Thomson visited Lady Hertford during the summer of 1727 at Marlborough and composed part of his *Spring* there is fairly certain.<sup>2</sup> Stephen Duck, another poet who later enjoyed the hospitality of Lady Hertford, wrote in his *Description of a Journey to Marlborough*:

From hence the Muse to silver Kennet flies,  
On whose green Margin Hertford's Turrets rise.  
Here often round the verdant Plain I stray,  
Where<sup>3</sup> Thomson sung his bold, unfetter'd Lay;  
Or climb the winding, mazy Mountain's<sup>4</sup> Brow;  
And, tho' I swiftly walk, ascent but slow.  
The spiral Paths in gradual Circles lead,

<sup>1</sup> Alnwick MSS, No. 110, p. 131. A quarto volume bound in green leather contains Mrs. Rowe's letters to Lady Hertford from ca. 1716 to 1737 copied in Lady Hertford's hand. A selection from these letters was published by her brother-in-law, Theophilus Rowe, after her death under the title *Miscellaneous Works in Prose and Verse of Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe* (London, 1739). The copy of this work in the Wellesley College Library bears the inscription in Thomson's hand "James Thomson—The Publisher's Gift." With rare exceptions the letters are undated both in the MS and in the published volume; internal evidence makes the dating of certain ones possible.

<sup>2</sup> See *The Poetical Works* (ed. J. Logie Robertson), p. 48.

<sup>3</sup> "Mr. Thomson compos'd one of his *Seasons* here" (Duck's note).

<sup>4</sup> "Marlborough Mount" (Duck's note).

Increase my Journey, and elude my Speed:  
 Yet, when at length I reach the lofty Height,  
 Towns, Vallies, Rivers, Meadows meet my Sight;  
 A thousand grateful Objects round me smile,  
 Whose various Beauties overpay my Toil.

Within the Basis of the Verdant Hill,  
 A beauteous Grot confesses HERTFORD's Skill;  
 Who, with her lovely Nymphs, adorns the Place;  
 Gives ev'ry polish'd Stone its proper Grace;  
 Now varies rustic Moss about the Cell;  
 Now fits the shining Pearl, or purple Shell:  
 CALYPSO thus, attended with her Train,  
 With rural Palaces adorns the Plain;  
 Nor with more Elegance her Grots appear,  
 Nor with more Beauty shines th' Immortal Fair.<sup>1</sup>

The description of Lady Hertford's grotto in the latter part of this quotation I shall have occasion to refer to again.

Thomson's *Spring* was published in the following year, 1728, with a fulsome Dedication to the Countess. "Happy!" he exclaims, "if I have hit any of those Images, and correspondent Sentiments, your calm Evening Walks, in the most delightful retirement, have oft inspired. I could add too, that as this Poem grew up under your Encouragement, it has therefore a natural Claim to your Patronage." The poem opens with the much-quoted apostrophe to his patroness:

Oh Hertford, fitted, or to shine in Courts  
 With unaffected Grace, or walk the Plain,  
 With Innocence, and Meditation join'd  
 In soft assemblage, listen to my Song,  
 Which thy own Season paints, when Nature all  
 Is blooming and benevolent like Thee.

This tribute, which, as a matter of fact, is justified by all that we know of Lady Hertford, surely does not indicate any break in their relations.

In the correspondence between Mrs. Rowe and Lady Hertford, Thomson holds a prominent place from this time forth. "I am more impatient to see Mr. Thomson himself than Mr. —s letter," declares Mrs. Rowe.<sup>2</sup> And later, in a letter perhaps referring to his

<sup>1</sup> *Poems on Several Occasions* (London, 1738), pp. 146-48.

<sup>2</sup> Alnwick MSS, No. 110, p. 215.

dedicatory epistle, she says, "The Verses I have enclosed for Mr. Thompson will satisfie y<sup>r</sup> La<sup>ty</sup> what my real thoughts are of what you were so obliging to transcribe for me I will not distress y<sup>r</sup> modesty with saying all I could on this subject. you could not more oblige me madam then putting a subscription for me to Mr. Thompsons Poems w<sup>ch</sup> I hope will meet as they deserve great encouragement."<sup>1</sup>

It is presumably to the first edition of *The Seasons*, subscriptions to which were advertised in 1728 though it was not published until 1730, that Mrs. Rowe wishes to subscribe, perhaps at Lady Hertford's suggestion. It is interesting, therefore, to note in the published list of subscribers that the Earl of Hertford took one book, the Countess of Hertford two, and Mrs. Rowe one. The verses which Mrs. Rowe inclosed in her letter were probably those entitled *To Mr. Thomson. On the Countess of ———'s praising his Poems*, in which she congratulates the poet on his good fortune in the lines,

Secure of glory crown thy head with bays  
Ambition sets its bounds in Delia's praise.<sup>2</sup>

In a subsequent letter Mrs. Rowe shows herself a lady of superior mind. Though an earnest Dissenter, and a warm friend of Isaac Watts, she is yet capable of enjoying Shaftesbury's *Characteristics* and Berkeley's *Minute Philosopher* when they appear, and she reports with amusement the orthodox distrust of Thomson's poetry evinced by her friend Mrs. Sewell. "She has happen'd to hear that Mr. Thompson is a Deist," writes Mrs. Rowe, "and since that I cannot get her to read a line of his, I might as well persuade her to read a conjuring book as any Poem writt by such a wicked man as she calls him."<sup>3</sup>

Thomson's *Hymn on Solitude* Lady Hertford apparently sent to Mrs. Rowe when it appeared in Ralph's *Miscellany* in 1729; for her correspondent writes ecstatically, "'Tis y<sup>r</sup> Ladyships Talent to oblige people with the best Grace in the World you almost prevented my impatieney for the pleasure of reading Mr. THOMPSON's Hymn w<sup>ch</sup> is really fine."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 232.

<sup>2</sup> E. Rowe, *Miscellaneous Works in Verse and Prose* (ed. Theophilus Rowe; London, 1772), I, 170.

<sup>3</sup> Alnwick MSS, No. 110, p. 234.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 242; Theophilus Rowe in publishing Mrs. Rowe's letter published the poem also. See *Miscellaneous Works* (1772), II, 192-94.

On the composition of this poem, the favorite perhaps among Thomson's shorter works, if we may judge by its prominence in anthologies, Lady Hertford's commonplace book throws interesting new light. In a letter to Mallet dated July 10, 1725, Thomson wrote: "To fill up this letter I shall give you a few loose lines I composed in my last evening walk, they may be once worth the reading but no more."<sup>1</sup> The lines were the first version (which I shall call the "A Version") of his *Hymn on Solitude*, reading as follows:

- Hail ever pleasing Solitude!  
 Companion of the wise and good!  
 But from whose awful piercing eye  
 The herd of fools and villains fly.
- 5 O, how I love with You to walk!  
 And listen to your silent talk  
 Which innocence and truth imparts,  
 And melts the most obdurate hearts.  
 A thousand shapes You wear with ease,
- 10 And still in every shape You please.  
 Now wrapt in some mysterious dream,  
 A sage Philosopher You seem;  
 Now a Religious port You bear,  
 And now a Hermit you appear;
- 15 Now o'er the meads and groves You fly,  
 And now you sweep the vaulted sky,  
 And Nature dances in your eye.  
 Then straight again You court the shade  
 And pining hang the pensive head;
- 20 A shepherd now You haunt the plain,  
 And warble forth Your oaten strain.  
 Now a gay Huntress by the dawn  
 You trip it o'er the dewy lawn.  
 A Lover now, with all the grace
- 25 Of that sweet passion in Your face  
 A thousand shapes You wear with ease,  
 And still in every shape You please,  
 Your's is the fragrant morning blush,  
 And your's the silent evening hush,
- 30 Your's the refulgent noonday gleam,  
 And your's, ah then! the gelid stream.  
 Descending angels bless Your train,

<sup>1</sup> P. Cunningham, "James Thomson and David Mallet," *Miscellanies of the Philobiblon Society* (London, 1857-58), IV, 7.

- The virtues of the Sage and Swain.  
 Soft Innocence in white array'd,  
 35 And Contemplation rears his head;  
 Religion with her awful brow  
 And all the Muses wait on You.  
 O, let me pierce Your secret cell,  
 And in Your deep recesses dwell,  
 40 For ever from the world retir'd,  
 For ever with your raptures fir'd;  
 Nor by a Mortal seen save he  
 A Mallet or a Murdoch be.

Among the Alnwick manuscripts is a leather-bound quarto volume inscribed on the flyleaf: "A Miscellany of Verse and Prose Begun March the 5, 1728."<sup>1</sup> Also on the flyleaf is written several times "F. Hartford" and "F H" as by someone trying a pen. Lady Hertford made entries in this volume in 1726 and during the years following. Pages 92-93 of this volume, written in Lady Hertford's hand, contain the following version of Thomson's poem (which I shall call the "B Version"):

#### A HYMN TO SOLITUDE

BY MR. THOMPSON

- Hail ever pleasing Solitude  
 Companion of the wise and good  
 But from whose holy peircing eye  
 The Herd of Fools and villains fly  
 5 Oh how I love with Thee to walk!  
 And listen to thy whisper'd Talk  
 Which innocence and truth imparts  
 And melts the most obdurate Hearts  
 A Thousand Shapes you wear with Ease  
 10 And still in every Shape you please  
 Now wrapt in Some mysterious Dream,  
 A lone Philosopher you seem,  
 Now o'er the Hills and Vales you fly  
 And now you sweep the vaulted Sky  
 15 And Nature dances in your Eye  
 Then straight again you court the shade  
 And pining hang the pensive head  
 A Shepherd now you haunt the Plain

<sup>1</sup> The ensuing pages contain entries at intervals for many years.

- And warble forth your oaten Strain  
 20 Then soft divided you assume  
 The gentle-looking Hertford's Bloom  
 As with her *Philomela* she  
 Her *Philomela* fond of Thee  
 Amid the long-withdrawing vale  
 25 Awakes the rival'd Nightingale.  
 A lover now with all the Grace  
 Of that Sweet Passion in your face!  
 A thousand Shapes you wear with Ease  
 And still in every Shape you please.  
 30 Thine is the unbounded breath of morn  
 Just as the Dew-bent Rose is born  
 And while meridian Fervors beat  
 Thine is the woodland dumb retreat  
 But cheif when evening Scenes decay,  
 35 And the faint landskip swims away,  
 Thine is the doubtfull dear decline  
 And that best hour of Musing thine  
 Descending Angels bless your train  
 The virtues of the Sage and Swain  
 40 Plain Innocence in white array'd  
 And Contemplation rears the Head  
 Religion with her awful brow  
 And wrapt Urania waits on you  
 Oh let me peirce thy Secret hill  
 45 And in Thy deep Recesses dwell  
 Forever from the World retir'd  
 Forever with thy Raptures fir'd  
 Nor by a mortal seen save He  
 A Lycidas, or Lycon be.

This, I take it, represents a re-working, perhaps in 1727 or 1728, of the earlier version, into a compliment to the poet's hostess and patroness, by the insertion of lines 20-25 (in place of 22-23 of the A Version) with their tribute to Lady Hertford and to her friend Mrs. Rowe, whose pen-name was "*Philomela*."<sup>1</sup> The alteration of the concluding lines of the poem also seems to indicate an adaptation of the poem to special circumstances: the "secret hill" in place of "secret cell" with its "deep recesses" may refer to the grotto under Marlborough Mount referred

<sup>1</sup> This lady's love of solitude was so extreme as to make her live the life of a recluse in her later years. Only occasionally was she tempted forth to visit Lady Hertford or her mother, the Hon. Mrs. Henry Thynne, girlhood friends.



to in Stephen Duck's descriptive verses already quoted. Another description of the same place occurs in a letter from Lady Hertford to Lady Pomfret dated Marlborough, June 10/21, 1739:

The trees I planted some years ago in my garden, though they now afford me a delightful shade (under which I pass many solitary hours), have no beauties that will appear upon paper, unless a pen like that of Mr. Pope should describe them. The grotto that we have made under the mount—and which, without partiality, I think is in itself much prettier than that at Twickenham—would, in my description, fall infinitely below it, as painted in one of Mr. Pope's letters.<sup>1</sup>

Apparently the names of Thomson's two friends, Mallet and Murdoch, were eliminated and "Lycidas" and "Lycon" substituted that there might be nothing to detract from the compliment to the Countess.

Soon after, I think, the B Version was subjected to certain minor changes—the rearrangement of certain lines, and two or three verbal changes, the most important of which was the replacing of "secret hill" of the B Version by "secret cell" of the A Version—and thus the C Version was published in 1729 in *Miscellaneous Poems, by Several Hands . . . Publish'd by Mr. Ralph*. It should be noted that this version is very different in important respects from that which appears in modern collections, notably *The Oxford Book of Eighteenth Century Verse* (1926), said to be reprinted from *Ralph's Miscellaneous Poems*.

#### HYMN ON SOLITUDE

Hail ever-pleasing Solitude!  
Companion of the Wise, and Good!  
But, from whose holy, piercing Eye,  
The Herd of Fools, and Villains fly.

- 5 O! how I love with thee to walk!  
And listen to thy whisper'd Talk;  
Which Innocence, and Truth imparts,  
And melts the most obdurate Hearts.

- A thousand Shapes you wear with ease,  
10 And still in every Shape you please;  
Now wrapt in some mysterious Dream,  
A lone Philosopher you seem;

<sup>1</sup> Correspondence between Frances, Countess of Hartford, (afterwards Duchess of Somerset,) and Henrietta Louisa, Countess of Pomfret, between the years 1735 and 1741 (2d ed.; London, 1806), I, 128-29.

- Now quick from Hill to Vale you fly,  
 And now you sweep the vaulted Sky,  
 15 And *Nature* triumphs in your Eye:  
 Than strait again you court the Shade,  
 And pining, hang the pensive Head.  
 A Shepherd next, you haunt the Plain,  
 And warble forth your oaten Strain.  
 20 A Lover now, with all the Grace  
 Of that sweet Passion in your Face!  
 Then, soft-divided, you assume  
 The gentle-looking H——d's Bloom,  
 As, with her *PHILOMELA*, she,  
 25 (Her *PHILOMELA* fond of thee)  
 Amid the long, withdrawing Vale,  
 Awakes the rival'd Nightingale.  
 A thousand Shapes you wear with Ease,  
 And still in every Shape you please.  
 30 Thine is th'unbounded Breath of Morn,  
 Just as the dew-bent Rose is born;  
 And while *Meridian* Fevers beat,  
 Thine is the Woodland dumb Retreat;  
 But chief, when Evening Scenes decay,  
 35 And the faint Landship swims away,  
 Thine is the doubtful dear Decline,  
 And that best Hour of musing thine.

- Descending Angels bless thy Train,  
 The *Virtues* of the Sage, and Swain;  
 40 Plain *Innocence* in white array'd,  
 And *Contemplation* rears the Head;  
*Religion*, with her awful Brow,  
 And rapt *URANIA* waits on you!

- Oh, let me pierce thy secret Cell!  
 45 And in thy deep Recesses dwell;  
 For ever with thy Raptures fir'd,  
 For ever from the World retir'd;  
 Nor by a mortal seen, save he  
 A *LYCIDAS*, or *LYCON* be.

Next, the C Version was revised slightly by the substitution in line 32 of "fervors" for "fevers," and in line 33 of "woodland's" for "woodland," and by certain alterations in spelling, capitalization, and punctuation. The D Version thus produced was printed in 1748 in the third volume of Dodsley's *Collection of Poems*. The first edition

appeared in January, a second in December;<sup>1</sup> 'he poet died in August of that year. This version may, therefore, represent Thomson's final preference; on the other hand, it may have been inserted by Dodsley, or by the Countess of Hertford, without the author's knowledge or approval, as was the case with Shenstone's *Schoolmistress*.<sup>2</sup>

When the revisions which produced the E Version, the version now universally reprinted, were made, and under what circumstances, I have been unable to discover. The poem was not included in the 1738 edition of Thomson's works. In the edition of his works which appeared in 1750, in that two-volume folio edition of 1762 with Murdock's memoir, said to contain the poet's "last corrections, additions, and improvements," in the four-volume edition published by Millar in 1766, and in the editions of 1768 (Edinburgh) and 1788, appeared this version which is reprinted in modern collections. Especially notable among the alterations in this version are the substitution of "Musidora" for "Philomela," and the addition of six new lines at the end of the poem, emphasizing effectively that contrast between town and country noted in the last stanza of the *Ode to Retirement* to be quoted later.<sup>3</sup> These lines are as follows:

Oh, let me pierce thy secret cell!  
And in thy deep recesses dwell;  
Perhaps from *Norwood's* oak-clad hill,  
When meditation has her fill,  
I just may cast my careless eyes  
Where *London's* spiry turrets rise,  
Think of its crimes, its cares, its pain,  
Then shield me in the woods again.

Comparison of three lines in the five versions will indicate that Lady Hertford's copy is nearest to the version of 1725 sent by the poet to Mallet; for this reason it is termed the B Version:

- A, l. 15: Now o'er the meads and groves you fly.
- B, l. 13: Now o'er the Hills and Vales you fly.
- C, l. 13: Now quick from Hill to Vale you fly.
- D, l. 13: Now quick from Hill to Vale you fly.
- E, l. 13: Now quick from hill to vale you fly.

<sup>1</sup> Ralph Straus, *Robert Dodsley, Poet, Publisher and Playwright* (London and New York, n.d.), pp. 334 and 337.

<sup>2</sup> Shenstone wrote to Lady Luxborough: "As to Dodsley's collection . . . I should have been better pleas'd with him if he had giv'd me previous notice e'er he published my *Schoolmistress* that I might have spruced her up a little before she appeared in so much company" (Straus, *Robert Dodsley*, p. 106).

<sup>3</sup> See below, p. 461.

A, l. 17: and Nature dances in your eye.  
 B, l. 15: and Nature dances in your eye.  
 C, l. 15: and Nature triumphs in your eye.  
 D, l. 15: and Nature triumphs in your eye.  
 E omits the line.

A, l. 20: a shepherd now.  
 B, l. 18: a shepherd now.  
 C, l. 18: a shepherd next.  
 D, l. 18: a shepherd next.  
 E, l. 15: a shepherd next.

The appearance of Thomson's first play, his tragedy *Sophonisba* (1730), is heralded in a letter from Mrs. Rowe. "Mr. Thomson has furnisht me with some of the most agreeable lines in the world to express my thoughts," she exclaims, and quotes those lines (from Act II, scene iii) so congenial to her solitary temper:

I want to be alone, to find some shade  
 Some solitary gloom there to shake off  
 This weight of Life this tumult of mankind,  
 And there to listen to the gentle voice  
 The sigh of Peace.

"'Tis a noble Tragedy," she continues, "I can't help prefering it to Mr. Addison's *Cato* the language and Sentiments have all a peculiar Grandeur The following lines give me a very good opinion of the author

Ye misterious Powers  
 Whose ways are ever Gracious ever Just  
 As ye think wisest best Dispose of me  
 But whether thro' your gloomy depths I wander,  
 Or in your mountains walk; give me the calm,  
 The steady, smiling Soul;

In reading this, a sort of Divine Contentment Spreads on the Mind I seem to want nothing but to be wiser and better. Of which you will think there is evident necessity."<sup>1</sup>

In 1730 Thomson went abroad as tutor to Charles Talbot, the young son of the solicitor-general, later Lord Chancellor Talbot, on whose death the poet wrote memorial verses in 1737. Thomson's desire was to gain through travel that accumulation of impressions

<sup>1</sup> Alnwick MSS, No. 110, p. 251.

which he held to be the stuff of poetry. His letters on this occasion to Bubb Dodington, to whom he had dedicated *Summer*, have been reprinted;<sup>1</sup> two passages only are of special interest here for their bearing on a later letter to Lady Hertford. From Paris, Thomson wrote on October 24, 1730:

Travelling has been long my fondest wish, for the very purpose you recommend. The storing one's imagination with ideas of all-beautiful, all-great, and all-perfect Nature: these are the true *Materia Poetica*, the light and colours, with which fancy kindles up her whole creation, paints a sentiment, and even embodies an abstracted thought. I long to see the fields where Virgil gathered his immortal honey, and tread the same ground where men have thought and acted so greatly!

And on November 28, 1731, he wrote from Rome:

I will make no apology for neglecting to do myself the honour of writing to you since we left Paris. I may rather plead a merit in not troubling you with long scrawls of *that travelling stuff*, of which the world is full even to loathing. . . . The enthusiasm which I had upon me, with regard to travelling goes off, I find, very fast. One may imagine fine things in reading ancient authors; but to travel is to dissipate that vision.

As to the date of Thomson's return from the Continent there has been some disagreement among biographers. Robertson says he returned to England in December, 1731.<sup>2</sup> Tovey sets the same date, adding: "It is probable that for some time he continued to live with or near the Talbots, and to work at leisure on this poem 'Liberty.'"<sup>3</sup> Neither scholar is able to tell what Thomson did in 1732. Sheils, on the other hand, who has the merit of being a contemporary of the poet, wrote: "With this young nobleman, Mr. Thomson performed (what is commonly called) The Tour of Europe, and stay'd abroad about three years."<sup>4</sup> Morel, on the evidence of a letter from Dr. Rundle to Mrs. Sandys, states with Robertson and Tovey that the travelers returned to Ashdown Park (Talbot's seat) in December,

<sup>1</sup> Seward, *Supplement to The Anecdotes of Some Distinguished Persons* (London, 1797), pp. 137-45; passages from the letters are quoted in the *Poetical Works* (Aldine ed., 1847), p. xlviii-lili.

<sup>2</sup> *Poetical Works* (ed. Robertson), p. xvii.

<sup>3</sup> *The Poetical Works of James Thomson. A New Edition with Memoir and Critical Appendices* by the Rev. D. C. Tovey, M.A. (London, 1897), I, xlv.

<sup>4</sup> *The Lives of the Poets of Great Britain and Ireland, By Mr. Gibber and Other Hands* (London, 1753), V. 203.

1731.<sup>1</sup> But he too is unable to discover Thomson's residence during the ensuing year. He writes: "A son retour à Londres, au milieu de décembre, 1732, après avoir passé l'été et partie de l'automne à la campagne,<sup>2</sup> il s'occupe achevement d'une œuvre de charité [the benefit for Dennis]."<sup>3</sup>

An unpublished letter from Thomson to Lady Hertford, dated Paris, October 10, 1732, indicates that if he returned to England in December, 1731, he was back in Paris most of the following year. The letter also expands the ideas of the letters to Dodington. It is copied in part, in Lady Hertford's hand, in her *Miscellany*,<sup>4</sup> but the original also is preserved among the Alnwick manuscripts.<sup>5</sup> It reads as follows:

LETTER FROM M<sup>r</sup> THOMSON WITH THE ABOVE  
WRITTEN POEM<sup>6</sup>

PARIS Oct 10 1732

MADAM

It was but yesterday that I recieved a letter you did me the honour to write April last the Banker there not having known how to send it me—I mention this only to prevent my being judged altogether inexcusable and not by way of apology for having so long neglected to pay my respects where they are so justly due. To speak naturally, as one who longed mightily to hear of

<sup>1</sup> Léon Morel, *James Thomson, sa vie et ses œuvres* (Paris, 1895), p. 99: "Dans sa lettre à Dodington, du 28 novembre [1731], il ne parle aucunement de retour; et cependant, son élève et lui étaient revenus à Londres avant la fin de décembre. La famille et les amis de Talbot se trouvaient réunis à Ashdown Park, sans doute pour les fêtes de la fin de l'année, et Rundle écrit [to Mrs. Sandys]: '... Toutes les neuf Muses sont arrivés ici avec Mr. Thomson, l'esprit et la vivacité avec Billy [William, Earl Talbot], et la sagesse, mais après avoir laissé derrière elle ses façons solennelles, avec le Solicitor.'"

"Murdock nous dit que Thomson fut, dès ce retour à Londres, pourvu par son patron d'une lucrative sinécure. Les choses n'allèrent pas si vite. Talbot n'était pas encore Chancelier, et n'avait pas la disposition des emplois qui pouvaient le mieux convenir à son poète, c'est-à-dire de ceux qui n'entraînaient aucune fonction active. Le 'tutor' continua donc, selon toutes probabilités, à vivre auprès de son élève, dans l'agréable hospitalité de Talbot. Il eut ainsi tout loisir d'écrire ce poème dont il avait conçu la pensée pendant son voyage, et qu'il avait mis sur le métier aussitôt après, s'il en faut croire ces vers du début:

'Musing, I lay: warm from the sacred walks,  
Where at each step imagination burns'

[*Liberty*, Part I, vss. 15, 16].

Le progrès du travail fut cependant très lent. L'année 1732 et la plus grande partie de 1733 s'étaient écoulées sans que la première partie du poème fût achevée."

<sup>2</sup> "Soit chez Talbot à Ashdown Park, soit à Eastbury, bien que Dodington fût alors en Irlande."

<sup>3</sup> Léon Morel, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

<sup>4</sup> Alnwick MSS, No. 116, pp. 185-89.

<sup>5</sup> *Percy Family Letters and Papers (1730-1738)* (Alnwick MSS), XXV, 75-76.

<sup>6</sup> *On the Death of Aikman*, a copy of which precedes the letter in the *Miscellany* (Alnwick MSS, No. 116, pp. 184-85).

your Ladyships health, I resolved a thousand times to write, and continually reproached my self for neglecting it; but then a vain Imagination of writing in the character of a traveller still prevented me: and like one who finds himself quite unable to answer his engagements, I desperately turn'd Bankrupt. The letter however you have honoured me with has awakened me to such a lively remembrance of your goodness, as makes me flatter my Self that, upon this ingenuous confession you will absolve me from any rash promise I made while the fairy prospect lay before me—There are certainly several very fine natural Scenes to be seen abroad, but they are saddened by the misery of their Inhabitants, and Scenes of human misery ought never to please but in a tragedy. The bad Government in Italy, and peticularly that of the Priests, has not only extirpated almost human arts and Industry but even disfigured Nature her self. Tho they might command all that can tend either to the convenience, pleasure, or magnificence of life, yet are they in some sort destitute of all. The gracious sun indeed still dispences to them his powerfull smiles, but him they are afraid of. It ought to be considered rather as the land of the dead than of the living. Suppose one who is perfectly master of the antient Poets and Historians suddenly transported there, without knowing what country it was; he would scarce I fancy find it out by their descriptions. After, 'tis true, having wandered through a vast desolate plain, where by degrees began to appear the tombs of Heroes, broken arches, and aqueducts, till at last thro' many majestic ruins he came to the palatine mount, the seat of the Imperial palace: here, would he say, astonished at the awful prospect, here must have stood Rome the mistress of the World—Behold an Empire dead! and those venerable ruins all around, these triumphal arches, pillars, remains of temples, Baths aqueducts and Amphitheatres are but her wide spread monument a monument, tho' made up of ruins, infinitely, infinitely more noble than all the other monuments of the world put together. Several peices of Grecian sculpture that may be said to adorn this monument are divine. was I writing to another than your Ladyship I might forget my self, and say, that they represent a finer nature than is to be found now-a-days. The famous Italian painters having taken their Ideas from them, no wonder that their works should be so vastly Superior to the painting of all other Nations, as they beyond comparison are. The language and musick of Italy are Inchanting. being but an Infant in the language I ought not to pretend to judge of it, yet I cannot help thinking it not only very harmonious, and expressive but even not at all incapable of manly Graces. as for their Music it is a sort of charming malady that quite dissolves them in Softness, and greatly heightens in them that Universal Indolence men naturally (I had almost said reasonably) fall into when they can receive little or no advantage from their Industry. They talk of the Tarantula in Italy for whose bite music is a cure. That Tarantula must, I fancy, mean the bad government, for whose oppression music if not a cure yet is at least some relief, by gently lulling them into a sweet forgetfulness of Misery. Now that I mention Music, one cannot, I believe, have a stronger



instance of the power of custom with regard to taste than one meets with here in the french opera. While they themselves die away in raptures at what they call their beaux morceaux others whose taste is form'd to the Italian musick would rather hear the screech-owl than their screaming heroines. their excessive vanity has led them into this difference of taste from others; for they will have a peculiar taste of their own, tho to have it they must forsake Nature. But it is time to make an end of these Impertinent observations. Now that I come to talk of France again, of which I troubled you with my Sentiments already.<sup>1</sup> It is hard that such a great nation as England cannot be decently proud enough, to have a standard of dress, exercises, & polite behaviour among themselves without thus always awkwardly Imitating a people they never either can nor ought to be like. I wish we would also imitate them in one thing and that is being as indifferent about them as they are about us. There has been this season, and still are, such a crowd of all ages and sexes here as must give foreigners a strange opinion of England. Their common notion of us is I reckon, of a cold, dark, dull, dirty country where there is nothing but money. Notwithstanding tho' of this prevailing fashion of Ladies traveling I despair of the honour of seeing y<sup>e</sup> Ladyship till next Spring in London. — as for me I am as much abandoned by the Muses as ever. The few lines I take the liberty to send you enclosed are rather a plain testimony of Friendship, than an attempt of poetry.

Give me leave to return you my most humble acknowledgement for the honour you did me in presenting my Book to the Prince of Wales. I wish it had been something more worthy of you to present, and of him to read. The approbation he was pleased to give a first Imperfect essay does not so much flatter my vanity as my hopes, of seeing the fine arts flourish under a Prince of his so noble equal humane and generous disposition; who knows how to unite the sovereignty of the Prince with the liberty of the People, and to found his happiness and Glory on the publick good. oh happy as a God he who has it both in his hand and his heart to make a people happy!<sup>2</sup>

Lord Hartford and Lady Betty do me a great honour in remembering me. My most respectful compliments and good wishes attend them, as also Lord Beachamp [*sic*]. Their Indisposition that you mention I hope is long ago past, and that last summer spent amidst the pursuits<sup>3</sup> of social retirement has made amends for the melancholy of the winter. How I long to get a little out of the storms of the city, where all the fiercer passions blow; and to pursue again the friendly calm of the country, agitated alone by the gentler ones. It delights me to hear that Mrs. Nevinson survived the great danger of death she was in. Her health is I hope now perfectly recovered. Nothing can give me greater pleasure than to hear of your Ladyships health. If I cannot have

<sup>1</sup> This would suggest an earlier letter to Lady Hertford.

<sup>2</sup> At this point the copy in the *Miscellany* ends; the conclusion of the letter is taken from the original (*op. cit.*, p. 76). The original letter I discovered only at the end of my last day at Alnwick. I had time merely to compare it rapidly with the portion in the *Miscellany* which I had already copied, and then to copy the final portion from the original letter.

<sup>3</sup> Word uncertain because of illegible manuscript.

the honour of a line from your hand, the Shortest written by your order cannot fail of making me very happy. Your commands will find me—à l'Hotel d'Espagne, rue Guenegaud faux-bourg St Germain, à Paris. I am with the sincerest respect

Madam,  
Your most obedient  
humble servant

JAMES THOMSON

The verses inclosed in this letter were those on the death of Mr. Aikman, a Scotch doctor and painter who died in London in June, 1731.<sup>1</sup> As in the case of the *Hymn on Solitude*, the draft of the poem sent by the poet to Lady Hertford lacks the revisions of the later printed version, the superiority of which recalls Somerville's admonitory epistle to his friend,

Why should thy Muse, born so divinely fair,  
Want the reforming toilette's daily care?  
Dress the gay maid, improve each native grace,  
And call forth all the glories of her face.<sup>2</sup>

In Lady Hertford's *Miscellany* the verses stand as follows:

#### A POEM ON THE DEATH OF MR. AIKMAN

BY MR. THOMSON

- Oh, could I draw, my friend, thy genuine mind  
Just as the living forms by thee designed,  
Of Raphael's figures none should fairer shine,  
Nor Titian's colours longer last than mine.
- 5 A mind in wisdom old, in lenience young,  
From fervent truth where every virtue sprung;  
Where all was real, modest, plain, sincere;  
Worth above show, and goodness unsever:  
Viewed round and round, as lucid diamonds throw
- 10 Still as you turn them a revolving glow,  
So did his mind reflect with secret ray  
In various virtues heaven's internal day;  
Whether in high discourse it soared sublime  
And sprung impatient o'er the hands of time,
- 15 Or, wandering nature through with raptured eye,

<sup>1</sup>Robertson adds the following notes to the poem: "Only the last eight lines were printed in Thomson's *Poems on Several Occasions*, published by A. Millar (price sixpence) in 1750. The whole piece was first printed in 1792 from a MS. in the possession of the Earl of Buchan" (*Poetical Works* [ed. Robertson], p. 444).

<sup>2</sup> *The Poetical Works of William Somerville*, "The Poets of Great Britain" (London, 1807), LXXVII, 26.

- Adored the hand that turned yon azure sky:  
 Whether to social life he bent his thought,  
 And the right poise of mingling passions sought,  
 Gay converse blest; or in the thoughtful grove
- 20 Bid the heart open every source of love:  
 New varying lights still set before your eyes  
 The just, the good, the social, or the wise.  
 For such a death who can, who would refuse  
 The friend a tear, a verse the mournful muse?
- 25 Yet pay we just acknowledgement to heaven,  
 Though snatched so soon, that Aikman e'er was given.  
 Grateful from Nature's banquet let us rise  
 Nor meanly leave it with reluctant eyes.  
 A friend, when dead, is but removed from sight
- 30 Sunk in the lustre of eternal light;  
 And, when the parting storms of life are o'er,  
 May yet rejoin him in a happier shore.
- As those we love decay, we die in part,  
 String after string is severed from the heart;
- 35 Till loosened life, at last but breathing clay,  
 Without one pang is glad to fall away.  
 Unhappy he who latest feels the blow,  
 Whose eyes have wept o'er every friend laid low,  
 Dragged lingering on from partial death to death,
- 40 Till, dying, all he can resign is breath.<sup>1</sup>

Promptly transmitted to Mrs. Rowe by Lady Hertford, the poem received from that lady only qualified praise in a letter dated November 11, 1732: "I am charm'd w<sup>th</sup> the Beauties w<sup>th</sup> which Mr. Thomson's muse has drawn M<sup>r</sup> Aikmans character," she writes, "but am rather more delighted with that elegant simplicity & natural innocence that appears in y<sup>r</sup> La<sup>sp</sup> Pastorels."<sup>2</sup>

The letter itself bears interesting relation to Thomson's later

<sup>1</sup> Alnwick MSS, No. 116, pp. 184-85. The improvement in the published version of this poem is another fortunate instance of the poet's power of self-criticism: ll. 27-28 are omitted; at the beginning of l. 30 "Sunk" is changed to "Hid"; between l. 30 and l. 31 are inserted four fine lines to the deepening of the thought. Of this poem Morel writes: "Ces quarante-deux vers ne furent pas publiés du vivant de l'auteur. Les huit derniers, furent imprimés dans l'édition des œuvres de 1750. Ils avaient sans aucun doute été communiqués par Lyttelton, car le manuscrit s'en trouve encore dans les archives de la famille à Hagley [Phillimore, *Life of Lord Lyttelton*, I, 312]. La pièce entière était en la possession du comte de Buchan et fut publiée par lui en 1792 [*Essays on the lives and writings of Fletcher of Saltoun and the Poet Thomson*]" (op. cit., p. 98 n.). It now appears, however, that Lady Hertford also had possession of a complete copy of the poem, and she rather than Lyttelton may have been instrumental in its first partial publication.

<sup>2</sup> Alnwick MSS, No. 110, p. 317. This is one of the few dated letters in the collection.

poetry. It contains, of course, the germ of his long and unsuccessful poem, *Liberty*, the first part of which came out in 1735 under the title, *Ancient and Modern Italy Compared*, with a Dedication to Frederick, Prince of Wales. The sentiments expressed in the letter are echoed in such lines of the poem as

. . . . Mark the desponding Race,  
Of Occupation void, as void of Hope;  
Hope the glad Ray, glanc'd from Eternal Goods,  
That Life enlivens, and exalts it's Powers,  
With views of Fortune—Madness all to them!  
By the relentless seiz'd their better Joys,  
To the soft aid of cordial Airs they fly,  
A kind Oblivion breathing o'er their Woes,  
And Love and Music melt their Souls away [ll. 190-98].

The letter recalls, too, passages in *The Castle of Indolence*; e.g., the conflict between the Knight of Art and Industry and the Demon of Indolence in the second canto, and the description of the important part which music plays in the enchantment.

Soon after his return from abroad Thomson must have called upon his patroness, perhaps in London, as he suggested, for Mrs. Rowe writes on March 26, 1733: "I am pleased to hear of any improv'ment that so fine a Genius as Mr. Thomsons has gained by His Travels."<sup>1</sup>

On June 13, 1735, the poet was again Lady Hertford's guest, this time at St. Leonard's Hill, Windsor Forest, where he seems to have composed another poem carefully copied by the countess into her *Miscellany*, though never, so far as I have seen, included in any published collection:

TO RETIREMENT  
AN ODE

Wrote at ST. LEONARD' HILL  
By Mr Thomson  
June 13<sup>th</sup> 1735

1.

Come calm Retirement! Sylvan Power!  
That on St. Leonard's lov'st to walk,  
To lead along the thoughtful Hour  
And with the gentle Hartford talk.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 324. This letter also indicates a return from the Continent late in 1732 or early in 1733.

## 2.

From Thee, when vernal Nature Blooms  
With tender Soul the Bosom glows;  
And thro' the Woodland Summer Glooms  
The Zephirs breathe from Thee Repose.

## 3.

By Thee brown Autumn bounteous spreads  
Or pensive melts the soften'd Heart;  
Even hoary winter's leafless shades  
A solemn joy from Thee impart.

## 4.

Come, let thy cloud-dispelling Hand  
Awaken the Poetic eye,  
With finer Beauties deck the land  
With purer Azure swell the sky.

## 5.

Oh lead me to yon airy steep  
With tufted Trees inviting Crown'd;  
Or plunge me in the Forrest deep,  
A Sea of Wood that Waves around!

## 6.

There let me thrid the verdant maze,  
In search of Scenes grotesque and new,  
Of Glades that draw the lengthen'd Gaze,  
Of opening Lawns that chear the view.

## 7.

Hark! nought is heard but Natures voice!  
The whispering Breeze, the tuneful Throat:  
See! how her harmless sons rejoyce,  
Their wanton Tyrant Man forgot.

## 8.

Then is the time to calm the mind  
A trembling then uncertain Tide;  
To bid the Hearts tempestuous wind  
Into a sighing gale subside.

## 9.

And lo! where On Augusta's Shore,  
 The Human Tempest roars amain;  
 What wretches there their fate deplore!  
 Oh cover me ye woods again!<sup>1</sup>

On this Mrs. Rowe comments briefly, "Mr. Thomson's verses on Retirement are really fine."<sup>2</sup>

The similarity of the thought of the final stanza of this poem to that of the concluding line of the E Version of the *Hymn on Solitude* is to be noted. The poem, if Thomson's, perhaps represents extempore composition.

Another poem is linked with this one in the Index to the *Miscellany* (this portion, at least, of the Index is in Lady Hertford's own hand); the entry stands as follows:

On a Lady's undertaking to tell a Gentleman what he thought on feeling his Pulse. Mr. Thomson.

To Retirement an Ode by the same.

The other poem, perhaps the casual fruit of the same festive occasion, is also preserved in Lady Hertford's copy, as follows:

ON A LADY'S UNDERTAKING TO TELL A  
 GENTLEMAN WHAT HE THOUGHT ON  
 BY FEELING HIS PULSE

## 1.

Taught by the Pulse, in vain Clarinda tries  
 From the mixt mass the favourite thought to Call;  
 Whilst at her touch such sweet Disorders rise,  
 And the comparing Hand Confounds them all.

## 2.

Yet if Clarinda ought of Pulses knows,  
 If she their faithful Silent Language hears;  
 Then did she learn a Thousand tender woes,  
 That lay Conceal'd among a Thousand Fears:

## 3.

Then did she learn what neither look nor sigh,  
 Can speak pathetic, nor the Muse's strain;  
 And what must buried in my Bosom ly,  
 Till piteous she shall ask my Pulse again.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 116, pp. 229-30.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 110, p. 351.

## 4.

Ah fatal pity! so the Docter dire  
 Feel the tumultuous vein, him self tranquil,  
 Exults inhuman in the rising Fire  
 Protracts the Pain, and cares not tho' he kill.<sup>1</sup>

If this is Thomson's composition, as appears likely, courtly conceits were obviously not his forte; presumably he knew it and suppressed the poem.

At the close of this visit Thomson's host accompanied the poet on his homeward way; the following day, June 14, 1735, Lord Hertford writes to his wife: "In the first place I must tell You that I got hither very well, but left Mr. Thomson at Hammersmith where he took boat as he said in order to go to Mr. Doddington, but I fancy he will go a little farther."<sup>2</sup>

In one of her last letters to Lady Hertford, Mrs. Rowe, who died in 1737, writes: "I have been Reading over Mr. Thomsons Seasons with a new and truly Rational delight one would think you had sat for the Picture of the Spring. The Resemblance I found, induced me to copy it, for Drawing is the Constant amus'ment of my Leisure time."<sup>3</sup> It would seem that in her retirement at Frome, "Philomela" was enjoying the fine engravings by Kent for Thomson's *Seasons*, and tracing in one of the figures in the frontispiece to *Spring* the lineaments of her friend.

The record of Thomson's reputation as a dramatist is now carried forward in the correspondence of Lady Hertford with another of her circle, the Countess of Pomfret, the lady so often maligned by Horace Walpole.

Of *Edward and Eleanora* Lady Hertford writes from London in February, 1739:

I think you in the right, to be angry with our poets for neglecting so many fine subjects as the English history affords for the theatre; and am glad I can inform you that a subject named in your last will appear at the play-house in Covent-Garden in about a fortnight: It is the history of Edward the First and his queen, written by Mr. Thomson.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 116, p. 228.

<sup>2</sup> *Percy Family Letters and Papers (1730-1736)* (Alnwick MSS), XXV, 216.

<sup>3</sup> Alnwick MSS, No. 110, p. 359.

<sup>4</sup> *Correspondence*, I, 99-100.



A little later she reports:

Mr. Thomson's play of Edward and Eleanora has met with the same fate as Gustavus Vasa, in being forbidden. I think all the world seem in worse humour than ever I saw them in before; or else I look through smoked glasses—which I really believe is not the case, for I never felt my own house more peaceful than it is at this hour.<sup>1</sup>

In June, 1739, she writes to Lady Pomfret:

I hope your route will lead you to the Fontaine de Vancluse, which Petrarch has made so famous in his Sonnets, and which is also celebrated in an Epistle of Madame Des Houlières to Mademoiselle La Charce, whose story I dare say you are not unacquainted with. Mr. Thomson told me he had seen this fountain; and he promised to give me the description of it in verse: but the promises of poets are not always to be depended upon.<sup>2</sup>

In June of the same year she writes from St. Leonard's Hill: "I have read Mr. Thomson's Edward and Eleanora. I hear, it is the fashion to decry it extremely; but, I own, I am ungenteel enough to prefer it infinitely to Agamennon."<sup>3</sup> (*Agamennon* had appeared in April of the preceding year.) And in August she tells Lady Pomfret—who is in Italy:

I write by this post to order my bookseller to send you Gustavus Vasa, Edward and Eleanora, and Mr. West's poem, which he calls a Canto of Spenser. I venture to add Mrs. Carter's translation of signor Algarotti's book of Light and Colours.<sup>4</sup>

Lady Pomfret, who is more of a blue-stocking than Lady Hertford, writes critically from Florence on February 7, 1740:

Spenser's Canto charms though it condemns me. Edward and Eleanora tires and provokes me: the first by its stupidity; the last, that a man who is capable of feeling should choose such a subject to destroy. Gustavus Vasa has greatly my approbation, and I think the prohibition of it a more severe libel than any I have read.<sup>5</sup>

Finally of Thomson's last dramatic work, *The Masque of Alfred*, Lady Hertford writes from Richkings on September 10, O.S. 1740:

As to books, I have met with nothing new lately, except a Masque which was written by the Prince of Wales's command and represented at Cliefden. The subject of it is the history of Alfred; and the scene is laid in the isle of Athelney, in Somersetshire, where he was at the neatherds house. The clown

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 117-18.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 130.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 126.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 147.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 209-10.

and his wife are made to speak the dialect of a hero and heroine in a court. The whole conduct of the piece is incorrect. There are two or three fine speeches, several party hints, and one invidious reflection—which did not need the pains that have been taken (by presenting it in a different character) to make it absolutely unpardonable. This fine performance is the joint work of Mr. Thomson and Mr. Mallet.<sup>1</sup>

From this point the correspondence of Lady Hertford with another friend takes up the story. From Mrs. Knight (later Lady Luxborough), Bolingbroke's half-sister, Lady Hertford had been separated since 1736. When their intercourse is resumed Mrs. Knight writes on August 20, 1742: "I enquir'd after Thompson of Mr. Symmer<sup>2</sup> but don't hear that he has publish'd very lately; but of him I should not speak since you have renounced y<sup>r</sup> Love for Poetry; Your preferring Truth to Fiction I do not wonder at but I fear one reads as many Untruths in Prose."<sup>3</sup> To this Lady Hertford replied on September 7, 1742:

I have not seen Thomson almost these three Years he keeps Company with scarce any Body but Mallet & one or two of the Players, & indeed hardly any body else will keep Company with him, He turns Day into Night, & Night into Day & is (as I am told) never awake till after Midnight & I doubt has quite drown'd his Genius.<sup>4</sup>

But though in an earlier letter Lady Hertford had disclosed to her friend a sad middle-aged tendency to turn from poetry to works of fact, she had not abandoned her interest in poets, or in Thomson at least. A manuscript letter of hers, bound in the front of a volume of her published letters in the British Museum, reads as follows:

PERCY LODGE Aug. 9th [1744?]

MR. DODSLEY

I was very much obliged to y<sup>e</sup> (tho I have not told y<sup>e</sup> so sooner) for the Verses upon the Death of Mr. Pope & without any Compliment [words obliterated] think y<sup>e</sup> own were much the best amongst them, the Epigram upon [obliterated] Sara is a very good one. I see there is another Complaint come out, which I should be glad to have & my Lord would have the other numbers of Travels & the History of England but does not care for the naval

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, 61-62.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Symmer was the tutor of Lord Brooke, Lady Hertford's nephew, who lived near Mrs. Knight.

<sup>3</sup> *Percy Family Letters and Papers* (Alnwick MSS), LXXVII, 174.

<sup>4</sup> *Brit. Mus. MSS Add.* 23728.

History. I directed a Letter to Mr. Thomson some time agoe to be left at y<sup>r</sup> House I should be glad to know that he has received it. Is Mr. Dalton Dead or alive? or where is he if above ground.

I am  
Y<sup>r</sup> sincere Friend  
HARTFORD<sup>1</sup>

Of Thomson's last work, *The Castle of Indolence*, published in 1748, Lady Hertford writes Lady Luxborough on May 15 of that year in the letter so often quoted:

I conclude you will read Mr. Thomson's *Castle of Indolence*: 'tis after the manner of SPENCER, but I think he does not always keep so close to his Stile, as the *Author of the School-Mistress*, whose Name I never knew, till you were so good as to inform me of it. . . . I believe it [*The Castle of Indolence*] will afford you Entertainment; there are many pretty Paintings in it, but I think the *Wizard's Song* deserves a Preference: "He needs no Muse who dictates from his Heart."<sup>2</sup>

A few months later, on November 14, 1748, Lady Luxborough replies (in a letter unpublished, I think) with an account of the grief over Thomson's death displayed by a group of littérateurs assembled at Lyttelton's seat. Lady Luxborough writes to Lady Hertford:

At Hagley we learn'd ye Death of Mr. Thomson w<sup>th</sup> Mr. Lyttleton was grieving at under one Tree & Mr. Shenstone under another as we walk'd in ye gloomy part of ye Park; the latter is actually setting up an Urn to his Memory in what he calls Virgils grove to whom he erected an obelisk some time ago surrounded by Cascades of Water as I believe I wrote y<sup>r</sup> L.<sup>p</sup> word. . . .

We [Shenstone and Lady Luxborough] have at present a great dispute about y<sup>e</sup> Seasons of ye Year, his dislike being perticularly to Autumn w<sup>th</sup> is y<sup>e</sup> Season I admire, but in spite of me he rails at it, & Mr. Thomson's death just at that time made him take it more w<sup>th</sup> he expresses in y<sup>e</sup> Lines I enclose w<sup>th</sup> were writ in more a manner extempore; He is in ye right to regret him for from the time Mr. Lyttleton had introduced him to Mr. Shenstone's he approv'd of the Taste of ye Latter, contracted a Friendship w<sup>th</sup> him & Mr. Shenstone hope he'd have continued it, & have criticis'd or corrected what he writes w<sup>th</sup> would have been an advantage to a Young Poet . . . there are some pretty Paintings as y<sup>r</sup> L.<sup>p</sup> expresses it in ye Castle of Indolence. Mr.

<sup>1</sup> Bound in the front of Vol. I of the *Correspondence between Frances, Countess of Hartford and Henrietta Louisa, Countess of Pomfret* (1805) (Brit. Mus. 10920, cc. 34). An *Elegy on the Death of Mr. Pope* was advertised by Dodsley on June 22, 1744 (Straus, *Robert Dodsley*, p. 327); and Young's *The Complaint (Night the Sixth)* was published by Dodsley on March 30, 1744 (*ibid.*, p. 326).

<sup>2</sup> Thomas Hull, *Select Letters between the Late Duchess of Somerset, Lady Luxborough . . . and Others* (London, 1778), I, 68-69. Cf. *supra*, p. 441.

Shenstone thinks he sh<sup>d</sup> not have anticipated y<sup>e</sup> Deseases & Inconveniency of Indolence in his 1<sup>st</sup> Canto as they are so largely displayed in y<sup>e</sup> 2<sup>d</sup> where they'd have appear'd more strikingly.<sup>1</sup>

Into her *Miscellany* Lady Hertford copied Shenstone's tribute to the dead poet under the title, "Written in Autumn 1748 by Mr. Shenstone";<sup>2</sup> and also "Verses by Mr. Dyer" on Thomson, beginning,

O Thomson we have long in absence lain  
And long in Silence have we ever met  
As Friend met Friend? . . . .

Dyer's *Grongar Hill* (published in 1726) occupied a prominent place in the opening pages of the *Miscellany*, as we might expect.

On November 20, 1753, at the time when Dodsley was gathering material for the later volumes of his *Collection of Poems*, Lady Hertford writes to Shenstone:

I cannot help mentioning another Copy of Verses of yours, which, if it is not already printed, I hope you will permit Mr. Dodsley to add to his new Collection, and that is *Damon's Bower*, occasioned by the Death of Mr. Thomson. If you should have mislaid the Original, I have a copy at your Service, which I will transmit either to you, in Case you should have a Mind to look it over again, or transmit it directly to Mr. Dodsley.<sup>3</sup>

Doubtless she refers to the verses transmitted to her by Lady Luxborough and copied in the *Miscellany*. This request to Shenstone suggests the possibility that the appearance of Thomson's *Hymn on Solitude* in the early form in Dodsley's third volume may also have been due to Lady Hertford's efforts.

Finally, the Countess's admiration for Thomson's poetry is suggested not only by the record of her correspondence from 1726 to 1753, but also by the quality of her own verse. Many of her compositions preserved in manuscript discover not genius but a sympathetic observation of nature and a delight in country life expressed now realistically and now rhapsodically. Of the former type is a poem, "To the East Wind," inclosed in a letter to Lady Pomfret in 1741, two stanzas of which read:

<sup>1</sup> *Percy Family Letters and Papers (1746-1751)* (Alnwick MSS), XXX, 199-200.

<sup>2</sup> Alnwick MSS, No. 116, pp. 265-67.

<sup>3</sup> Hull, *op. cit.*, I, 183.

My harmless lambs upon the green,  
 Were wont to frisk in wanton play,  
 But shiv'ring now and dull are seen,  
 Bleating beside the racks for hay:  
 The blossoms from my pear-trees fall,  
 And naked leave the western wall.

That wall, which us'd to charm my sight  
 With varied blooms adorn'd and gay,  
 Can now afford me no delight,  
 Whilst you its glories sweep away:  
 If in my borders vi'lets blow,  
 You bury them in flakes of snow.<sup>1</sup>

And a paean in blank verse, reminiscent of Thomson, is entitled, "A Soliloquy written at the Hermitage at St. Leonard's Hill May the 25th 1732"; it begins:

Great God of Nature! in this Sylvan Scene  
 While I admire thy various Works O Teach  
 My Soul thro' all their Plenty to Pursue  
 Thy forming Hand, & render Thee the Praise:  
 . . . . .  
 Thy Powerful word first bade the Riv'lets flow,  
 In which the Sun burnt Cattle Slake their Thirst,  
 And cool their limbs, Parch'd with the Mid Day Heat.<sup>2</sup>

Lady Hertford's interest in Thomson, dating from the appearance of *Winter* in 1726, arose primarily, I think, from her delight in his appreciation of natural beauty, and the visual appeal of his descriptions of country landscape; it is such detailed and realistic description that she often essayed in her own verses. She shared with Mrs. Rowe also a sympathy for the deistic doctrine of the religion of nature to which he gave pre-eminent expression in the *Hymn* at the close of the *Seasons*, for his sense of the harmony of the natural universe, and the healing peace of rural solitudes, to which her spirit turned perhaps more instinctively than his. The appeal of his poetry to her romantic taste and its influence upon her own writing are worth noting because the Countess of Hertford stands as the representative of a distinguished group of readers including, as her own circle included, cultivated members of the leisured middle class as well as maids of honor,

<sup>1</sup> *Correspondence*, III, 45.

<sup>2</sup> Alnwick MSS, No. 115, pp. 78-79.

men and women for whom life was something other than the existence of town and court, and literature something more than a record of its social gestures. The letters of Lady Hertford and her circle prove the justice of the surmise of one of the ablest of Thomson's modern editors: "The age itself, perhaps," wrote Rev. D. C. Tovey, "had surer instincts than its poets; it might be shown that readers were sighing for the country while poets were making for the town," adding, only too truly, "London did much to spoil Thomson."<sup>1</sup> In the second quarter of the eighteenth century Lady Hertford and her friends followed eagerly the work of the rising school of minor poets—Thomson, Dyer, Savage, Duck, Shenstone, Somerville, etc.—whose descriptive poetry portrayed the beauty of the world of nature which the poets had really seen, and whose narrative verse revealed the life of the common man and the spirit within him.

On three points, then, the material in the Alnwick MSS throws new light: on Thomson's friendly relations with the Countess of Hertford up to the time of his death; on the composition of the *Hymn on Solitude*; and on his continental travels and his residence in 1732. In addition to the unpublished letter from Paris, two unpublished poems, the *Ode to Retirement* and the verses *On a Lady's undertaking to tell a Gentleman what he thought on by feeling his Pulse*, and an early version of the lines *On the Death of Mr. Aikman* are discovered. The two new poems, if Thomson's they are, as seems to me likely, were probably extempore compositions written during some visit to Lady Hertford in the years 1730-35.

HELEN SARD HUGHES

WELLESLEY COLLEGE

<sup>1</sup> *The Poetical Works of James Thomson* (ed. D. C. Tovey; London, 1897), I, xlv.

## THE RÔLE OF GULLIVER

In Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, who is Gulliver; what is he? It is easy to give two wrong answers in a breath: he is Swift in disguise; or he is, as William A. Eddy puts it, "the allegorical representative of man, as truly as Christian is in *Pilgrim's Progress*."<sup>1</sup> Since Gulliver is the one figure absolutely vital to the scheme of Swift's most complicated and effective book, this figure may well be worth all the analysis anyone is able to give it, as it doubtless embodies all that Swift was capable of in artistic creation of character.

That Gulliver is not Swift himself in either intellect or disposition is abundantly certain. The Swift of 1726-27 (the period of *Gulliver's Travels*) was in his intellectual perceptions, witness his achievements up to that time in politics<sup>2</sup> and in literature,<sup>3</sup> almost as keen as any recorded human being. With Gulliver, it is a very different matter: a good sound fellow enough, but slow to seize upon even an obvious new idea; far from brilliant. And Gulliver's disposition is equally remote from Swift's. Gulliver possesses an easy good nature. He is ready of his sympathy and affection. He has a just sense of his own mediocrity (at least to begin with, he has!) and appears almost humbly unobtrusive in his ways. But in Gulliver lies that most precious capacity for acquiring knowledge: slowly, surely, he learns. Swift seems, on the other hand, to be afire with impatience that comes from too clear insight. While he was undoubtedly sympathetic, his sympathy was frequently obscured to the world by his so-called arrogance. (Can a man so genuinely superior as Swift was to his associates, in many ways, be justly called arrogant for realizing his superiority?) Swift was capable of devotion to individuals such as we look for in vain in Gulliver. Swift was profoundly humorous, while Gulliver, though he may be the cause that wit sparkles in other men, is hardly witty in himself. Scorn and rage at iniquity constitute the very tem-

<sup>1</sup> William A. Eddy, *Gulliver's Travels, a Critical Study*, p. 100.

<sup>2</sup> From 1710 to 1713, it would be difficult to maintain that any man in England wielded greater political weapons than Swift. Ten years later (1724), Swift showed his political pre-eminence in Ireland.

<sup>3</sup> Before 1726, Swift had published, among many lesser things, *The Tale of a Tub*, 1704; *Battle between the Ancient and Modern Books*, 1704; *The Drapier Letters*, 1724.



per of Swift. In Gulliver, these things are induced gradually, against the grain. Only that passion in readers for assuming the autobiographic can account for any confusion of Gulliver with Swift.

No more is Gulliver "the allegorical representative of man." He is not everyman, by any means, but as much an individual, almost, as Parson Adams or Squire Western (figures, both of them, somewhat typical and somewhat special). In certain ways, he surpasses the average man and, in certain other ways, he is peculiar or just different from the average without being superior or inferior. He is, to be sure, an example of a man getting knowledge or wisdom. But Swift is able for his purposes to create a human being much more perfectly appropriate and more real than a mere average or representative figure. So quietly natural is the process of creation in Swift's hands that it has scarcely been appreciated as a marvel of artistry. Gulliver is an entirely credible and probable person at the same time that he is precisely the person to enforce Swift's demonstration. Swift, obviously enough, desires to communicate his own thoughts and passions regarding human beings to the readers of his book. That is, in a general sense, one of the reasons for all efforts of an artistic sort. To infect others with his own ardent misanthropy,<sup>1</sup> Swift could not have chosen a more effective human instrument than Lemuel Gulliver, it would seem.

Gulliver's individual traits stand forth sufficiently for anyone who seeks, in the two earlier voyages—that to Lilliput and that to Brobdingnag. Here we have the "given quantity" (but how far from a stiff symbol is Gulliver) upon which the demonstration is to be performed. It is, consequently, very important to comprehend the man as "given" in these two voyages before he has been perceptibly modified by his astonishing experiences.

The very first hints about Gulliver himself are unobtrusively but meticulously conveyed through the prefatory letter from Richard Sympson, publisher, to the reader, and through a second letter from Captain Gulliver (as it were, after the fact of publication) to his cousin Sympson.<sup>2</sup> In the former letter, Sympson apologizes for the travels as "a little too circumstantial"; while he excuses the tedious-

<sup>1</sup> Yet note upon this point Ernest Bernbaum in his *Introduction to Gulliver's Travels* (1920).

<sup>2</sup> In all unabridged editions of *Gulliver's Travels* these two letters immediately precede "A Voyage to Lilliput."

ness, in some measure, on the ground that "the author was so distinguished for his veracity, that it became a sort of proverb among his neighbors at Redriff, when any one affirmed a thing, to say it was as true as if Mr. Gulliver had spoke it." The letter from Gulliver to Sympson, in so far as it exhibits Gulliver, must be considered in any study of his rôle last rather than first, for it was supposed to have been written some time subsequent to the voyage to the Houyhnhnms. The quiet exposition of Gulliver's capacities and inclinations during his sojourn in Lilliput gives ample material for a reader's information; the man's intellectual caliber and emotional caliber are rather more than suggested though not altogether unfolded. He studied "physic," mathematics, and navigation (these three more than other things) for three years at Cambridge and for two years and seven months at Leyden. He must have had a share of brains, one would deduce. It was not all theory with him, either. After Leyden, he was three years ship's surgeon on voyages to the Levant. He then married and attempted to practice medicine in London, but without success. Six more years as ship's surgeon followed; three consecutive years on land again; poor fortune brought him as usual to the sea. Thus comes the voyage to Lilliput.<sup>1</sup> His province was evidently "marine" surgery and he worked with uniform success in his own province. Yet Gulliver was exceptional among marine surgeons, for he tells us:

My hours of leisure I spent in reading the best authors, ancient and modern, being always provided with a good number of books; and when I was ashore in observing the manners and dispositions of the people, as well as learning their language, wherein I had a great facility by the strength of my memory.<sup>2</sup>

Besides having sufficiently good brains for a considerable period of study, he had a remarkably agile and accurate memory.

Among the Lilliputians, Gulliver's character, both intellectual and moral, is thrown into relief. His natural inclinations emerge in spite of the astonishing circumstances, partly because of them. As always (or nearly always) he shows himself resourceful in ordinary and extraordinary physical emergencies. His bellowing and struggling very soon subside into meek-enough compliance and trust. "I thought it the

<sup>1</sup> "Lilliput," chap. i. In view of the great number of good editions of *Gulliver's Travels*, it seems wisest to avoid page references in favor of references to particular voyage and chapter. The biographical material surveyed up to this point is all to be found in the early pages of the chapter indicated.

<sup>2</sup> "Lilliput," chap. i.

most prudent method to lie still. . . ."<sup>1</sup> Gulliver soon finds ways of getting along tolerably, be the people big, little, or equine. He is adaptable in the restricted sense of being able to endure all sorts of uncouth occurrences equably. This does not imply much plasticity on his part. Intellectually he is deliberate if not actually slow; for he fails to realize the implications for mankind in the absurdities of Lilliputian politics, wars, religion, education. It is only at the close of the conversations with the King of Brobdingnag<sup>2</sup> that he gets an inkling of the significance to himself, to any Englishman, to any human being, of these adventures among the pygmies and the giants. He comes near to being a stolid Englishman. Not only is he intellectually deliberate; he is unsophisticated in many ways and capable only with considerable pains of sophistication. The whole book (all four voyages) might, not altogether inappropriately, be entitled *The Sophistication of Lemuel Gulliver*.

He is, congruously enough, decidedly good natured. He likes people—from six-inchers to sixty-footers. The Lilliputians who amused themselves by wantonly discharging arrows at Gulliver were treated by him with great gentleness.<sup>3</sup> He is compact of various loyalties. Who is more enthusiastic about his "dear native land" than Gulliver? In his protracted account of England,<sup>4</sup> her people and institutions, to the King of Brobdingnag, Gulliver is positively chauvinistic.

For I have always borne that laudable partiality to my own country which Dionysius Halicarnassensis with so much justice recommends to an historian: I would hide the frailties and deformities of my political mother, and place her virtues and beauties in the most advantageous light. This was my sincere endeavour in those many discourses I had with that mighty monarch, although it unfortunately failed of success.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* And a little later in the same chapter we find: "I confess I was often tempted while they were passing backwards and forwards on my body, to seize forty or fifty of the first that came in my reach, and dash them against the ground. But the remembrance of what I had felt . . . and the promise of honour I made them, for so I interpreted my submissive behavior, soon drove out these imaginations."

<sup>2</sup> "Brobdingnag," chap. vi.

<sup>3</sup> "Lilliput," chap. ii: ". . . As to the sixth, I made a countenance as if I would eat him alive. The poor man squalled terribly . . . but I soon put him out of fear: for, looking mildly, and immediately cutting the strings he was bound with, I set him gently on the ground, and away he ran."

<sup>4</sup> "Brobdingnag," chaps. vi, vii.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, chap. vii. Cf. in chap. vi: "Imagine with thyself, courteous reader, how often I then wished for the tongue of Demosthenes or Cicero, that might have enabled me to celebrate the praise of my own dear native country in a style equal to its merits and felicity."

And for all the harsh criticism leveled at English institutions by the attentive King,<sup>1</sup> Gulliver never admits that his own faith in her is at all seriously shaken. He is intellectually and temperamentally disinclined to alter his outlook upon human affairs and human beings; but we may probably assume that such downright condemnation of those beings and affairs as issued from the admired monarch's lips found subconscious lodgment in Gulliver's heart or brain. So his acquisition of wisdom may be supposed to have begun definitely in Brobdingnag; whereas his mature intellectual and temperamental stiffness had been proof against, what seems to most readers, the rather obvious exposure of the falseness of human affairs and human beings in Lilliput. It is clear that Gulliver is a loyal defender of human beings as such (as well as of Englishmen) from such passages as the following, addressed to the King of Brobdingnag:

I one day took the freedom to tell his majesty, that the contempt he discovered towards Europe, and the rest of the world, did not seem answerable to those excellent qualities of the mind he was master of. That reason did not extend itself with the bulk of the body: but on the contrary, we observed in our country, that the tallest persons were usually least provided with it. . . . And that, as inconsiderable as he took me to be, I hoped I might live to do his majesty some signal service.<sup>2</sup>

Here Gulliver undoubtedly conceives himself as a sort of defender of the essential excellence of the human species.

Perhaps the honest optimism and good nature of the man emerge more distinctly in his relations with individuals in Lilliput and Brobdingnag. It is not in him to be mean or resentful either to creatures one-twelfth his size or to those twelve times his size. In spite of the frightful plots<sup>3</sup> contrived against him at the instance of Skyresh Bolgolam and Flimnap, Gulliver flees without any impulse to vengeance. His good nature after such imminent perils is touched only to the point of resolving ". . . never more to put confidence in princes or ministers, where I could possibly avoid it; . . ." <sup>4</sup> Nowhere does Gulliver's good will to human beings shine clearer than in his sojourn at Brobdingnag; witness his forgiveness of the nearly fatal pranks

<sup>1</sup> Note particularly the concluding paragraph of "Brobdingnag," chap. vi.

<sup>2</sup> "Brobdingnag," chap. vi.

<sup>3</sup> "Lilliput," chap. vii.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, chap. viii. In this connection, note *ibid.*, chap. vii: "I had been hitherto all my life a stranger to courts, for which I was unqualified by the meanness of my condition."

played upon him by the farmer's boy<sup>1</sup> and the Queen's dwarf,<sup>2</sup> and, more positively, witness his genuine (though not passionate) affection for Glumdalclitch.<sup>3</sup> Not yet disillusioned by his experiences in Lilliput, he readily gives his unaffected admiration and friendship to the King and Queen of Brobdingnag (who happen to deserve what he bestows!).<sup>4</sup> This Gulliver is truly reluctant to be taught wisdom by experience.

As one voyage succeeds another, the student of the character of Lemuel Gulliver must carefully examine the framework of each adventure—what might be called the departures and the landfalls. There are two points to note: his attitude as husband and father and his professional experiences. He is presented to us as a loving and attentive husband up to the time of his return from Houyhnhnm-land.<sup>5</sup> His business has always been one that necessitates long absences from wife and children. To be sure, he has an "insatiable desire of seeing foreign countries," but that implies no "disaffection" for his family; it was not a case of taking one and rejecting the other. He had tried business at home and failed at it.<sup>6</sup> How naturally he chronicles his leave-taking for the voyage that led him to Brobdingnag.

My son Johnny, named so after his uncle, was at the Grammar School, and a towardly child. My daughter Betty (who is now well married, and has children) was then at her needle-work. I took leave of my wife, and boy and girl, with tears on both sides, and went on board the *Adventure*, a merchant-ship. . . .<sup>7</sup>

Gulliver is not a uxorious family-man, obviously; yet is a normal, kindly father and husband.

The second point to note in these bits of preface and conclusion is that Gulliver is getting ahead professionally. He may suffer many shipwrecks, but he keeps advancing; so it is impossible to maintain

<sup>1</sup> "Brobdingnag," chap. i.    <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, chap. iii.    <sup>3</sup> e.g., "Brobdingnag," chaps. ii, viii.

<sup>4</sup> See *ibid.*, chap. vii; and chap. v (for the Queen's virtues).

<sup>5</sup> After his return from Lilliput, Gulliver remains with his family two months. Then the desire "of seeing foreign countries would suffer me to continue no longer." That does not mean any discontent with his family, however; for he takes the greatest pains to provide them with "a good house" and "fifteen hundred pounds" and "an estate in land of about thirty pounds a year," etc. See "Lilliput," chap. viii, final paragraph.

<sup>6</sup> See *ibid.*, chap. i, the second and third paragraphs. And another attempt at setting down is chronicled in the fourth paragraph! See also the concluding lines of "Brobdingnag," chap. viii.

<sup>7</sup> "Lilliput," chap. viii, last paragraph: On his return from Laputa via Luggnagg and Japan, Gulliver "went straight to Redriff . . . and found my wife and family in good health" ("Laputa," chap. xi, last paragraph).

that lack of worldly success or recognition was souring his nature. The first voyage "... I accepted an advantageous offer from Captain William Pritchard, master of the *Antelope*, who was making a voyage to the South-Sea."<sup>1</sup> The second voyage, he merely records that he "took shipping" in a certain ship with a certain commander. But with the third voyage he achieves a better position.

... At last he [a captain] plainly invited me, though with some apologies, to be surgeon of the ship; that I should have another surgeon under me besides our two mates; that my salary should be double to the usual pay; and that having experienced my knowledge in sea-affairs to be at least equal to his, he would enter into any engagement to follow my advice, as much as if I had share in the command.<sup>2</sup>

Gulliver is now a man of solid professional repute, capable of large responsibility, still retaining his cheerful appetite for travel, "the thirst I had of seeing the world." The fourth voyage represents further professional advancement, the positive measure of success.

I continued at home with my wife and children about five months in a very happy condition, if I could have learned the lesson of knowing when I was well. I left my poor wife big with child, and accepted an advantageous offer made me to be Captain of the *Adventurer*, a stout merchantman of 350 tons: for I understood navigation well, and being grown weary of a surgeon's employment at sea, ... I took a skilful young man of that calling. ...<sup>3</sup>

Gulliver, our given quantity, turns out then, briefly, to be not an extraordinarily keen man in any way, not blessed (or cursed) with flashing and piercing insight. At the same time he is extraordinarily (though far from uniquely) endowed with a zest for experience, a curiosity to see and to know. He is, here, well above the average. In temperament, Gulliver is, again, not a mere typical man but a noticeably kindly, friendly, patriotic, perhaps even optimistic man. Sufficiently happy both in his family and in his profession, Gulliver is of a nature almost immune to meanness, selfishness, hatred, morbidity of any sort. If native land, wife, children, human race become dark and sinister and vile in his eyes, it will be (we must all admit) only for very potent, indubitable causes. His every predisposition is against misanthropy. But he has the capacity slowly and honestly to think. The human race may be conceived as individually pinning their faith to

<sup>1</sup> "Lilliput," chap. 1.

<sup>2</sup> "Laputa," chap. 1.

<sup>3</sup> "Houyhnhnms," chap. 1. Note the tone of tenderness at the beginning of this quotation. Gulliver has not yet attained by any means to true wisdom.



Gulliver, and reflecting, the while, "If Gulliver ever becomes a man-hater that will be the perfect demonstration (for such of us as can think) that the race is hateful. Experiences that transform the good Gulliver into a misanthropist would much more surely transform us others should we pass through them." At least, Swift seems to calculate some such effect of Gulliver upon readers of the book.

*Gulliver's Travels* is in some sort the education of this man—his higher education, that is—and we see his so-to-speak Freshman and Sophomore experiences in Lilliput and Brobdingnag, bewildering experiences to him, with little seemingly vital result, but nevertheless an indispensable first tilling of the intellectual soil from which no genuine fruits are to be expected until later. This "later" means in Laputa and in Houyhnhnms-land. His final years may now be viewed, leading as they do to a sort of degree of ultimate understanding or sophistication. The goal of the book is not reached until the last page. To deal with it otherwise than as an organic unit is altogether to mutilate it.

In "Laputa" there are signs that the middle-aged, good-natured Gulliver is no longer impervious to the terrible suggestions and implications for him (and for any man!) of present events. He begins to apply what he observes to the case of human beings as such, wherever. Having been told of the way in which the wife of a prime minister in Laputa has twice deserted her indulgent but preoccupied husband to take up her abode with "an old deformed footman, who beat her every day," having heard this, Gulliver promptly remarks:

This may perhaps pass with the reader rather for an European or English story, than for one of a country so remote. But he may please to consider, that the caprices of womankind are not limited by any climate or nation, and that they are much more uniform than can be easily imagined.<sup>1</sup>

That his disillusionment is well under way is indicated by certain reflections that we would never have heard upon the lips of that Gulliver who dealt so naïvely with the King and ministers of Lilliput.

These unhappy people were proposing schemes for persuading monarchs to choose favourites upon the score of their wisdom, capacity, and virtue; of teaching ministers to consult the public good; of rewarding merit, great abilities, eminent services; of instructing princes to know their true interest by placing it on the same foundation with that of their people; of choosing for employments persons qualified to exercise them; with many other wild impossible chimaeras. . . .<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Laputa," chap. II.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, chap. VI.



In many instances, in the third voyage, it would not be difficult to maintain that, for the time, Swift speaks through the lips of Gulliver. That does not mean, of course, that Gulliver is a disguise for Swift but merely that Gulliver is attaining wisdom.

There is a late flare-up of Gulliver's native good nature, philanthropy, and idealism in his experience at Luggnagg, apropos of the Struldbrugs or the people who never die. Certain persons of quality in Luggnagg volunteer to expound and exhibit the Struldbrugs to Gulliver. The mere prospect moves him more profoundly than any danger or any marvel previously encountered in the travels.

I freely own myself to have been struck with inexpressible delight upon hearing this account: [the account was very vague up to this point]. . . . I could not forbear breaking out into expressions perhaps a little too extravagant. I cried out as in a rapture; Happy nation where every child hath at least a chance for being immortal! Happy people who enjoy so many living examples of ancient virtue, and have masters ready to instruct them in the wisdom of all former ages! but, happiest beyond all comparison are those excellent Struldbrugs, who being born exempt from that universal calamity of human nature, have their minds free and disengaged, without the weight and depression of spirits caused by the continual apprehension of death.<sup>1</sup>

Not content with this exhortation, Gulliver proceeds (for the last time in his life, we may be sure) to pour forth his most cherished aspirations, which are characteristically marked by great good will to man. It impresses as the final struggle of Gulliver's buoyant soul against the inevitable, imminent wisdom of misanthropy.

. . . . If it had been my good fortune to come into the world a Struldbrug, as soon as I could discover my own happiness by understanding the difference between life and death, I would first resolve by all arts and methods whatsoever to procure myself riches. . . . In the second place, I would from my earliest youth apply myself to the study of arts and sciences, by which I should arrive in time to excell all others in learning. Lastly, I would carefully record every action and event of consequence that happened in the public, . . . with my own observations on every point. . . . By all which acquirements, I should be a living treasury of knowledge and wisdom, and certainly become the oracle of the nation. . . . I would entertain myself in forming and directing the minds of hopeful young men. . . . But my choice and constant companions should be a set of my own immortal brotherhood. . . . Where any of these wanted fortunes, I would provide them with convenient lodges round my own estate. . . .

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, chap. x.

These struldbrugs and I would mutually communicate our observations and memorials through the course of time, remark the several gradations by which corruption steals into the world, and oppose it in every step, by giving perpetual warning and instruction to mankind; which, added to the strong influence of our own example, would probably prevent that continual degeneracy of human nature so justly complained of in all ages.<sup>1</sup>

Such words and ideas could flow only from a temperament sufficiently sanguine, a generous disposition. No sooner has Gulliver's nature thus expressed itself than he receives a chilling lesson. The inhabitants of Luggnagg are diverted at his ingenuousness. They inform him that an immortal (struldbrug) becomes, *ipso facto*, a prey to "not only all the follies and infirmities of other old men, but many more which arose from the dreadful prospect of never dying."<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, typical struldbrugs are exhibited to Gulliver. The point for a student of Gulliver's character and rôle to note here is the remarkable docility with which he learns the lesson in all its implications. He has surmounted that dulness which prevented him from appreciating the suggestions for human nature and human affairs at Lilliput and Brobdingnag. The seed of the idea sprouts promptly in the brain so long apparently sluggish or impenetrable. He admits a great loss of "appetite for perpetuity of life," and even entertains the project of transporting "a couple of struldbrugs to my own country, to arm our people against the fear of death."<sup>3</sup> Disillusioned as he is in many respects, Gulliver still is concerned to benefit people. His education is not finished; his pilgrimage as yet uncompleted.

In the light of the first three books of the *Travels*, it is not only necessary but natural to expect the fourth. The reader has been lured in the steps and into the thoughts of Gulliver by an unobtrusive and unwavering art not immeasurably less masterly though perhaps less lovely than the art of Milton in tracing the degeneration of Satan or that of Shakespeare in patiently following the gradual ruin of King Lear's body and mind.

Gulliver, after dwelling for a period among the admirable Houyhnhnms and observing with horror their filthy but thoroughly human slaves, the Yahoos, shows himself such an adept at receiving unfamiliar and uncongenial ideas that he may be pronounced educated or sophisticated more utterly than any other recorded man! For a meas-

<sup>1</sup> "Laputa," chap. x.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, last two paragraphs.

ure of his growth in comprehension of things,<sup>1</sup> it is convenient to contrast his account to his master, the Dapple Gray Houyhnhnm,<sup>2</sup> of mankind (particularly Englishmen) with his account of the same species to the King of Brobdingnag.<sup>3</sup> Every item in the account to the Dapple Gray is presented in a disgraceful light where each had been set forth with bellicose patriotism and philanthropism in the account at Brobdingnag. Our long and intimate acquaintance with Lemuel Gulliver in the earlier voyages has led us almost imperceptibly to cherish a not inconsiderable liking for him and (more significantly) to feel a measure of confidence in his good nature and his general capacity. The result is that we find ourselves inclined to accept his views. Shocking and ferocious as the attack on man may be in the "Voyage to the Houyhnhnms," we are conducted with singular gentleness, everything considered, by our friend Gulliver through all the desolation of humanity. We tend to believe him until the tale is done and we have had a chance to appreciate the indictment. Then comes the ferocious shock rather than in the reading.

Gulliver explains innocently his reason for the new attitude toward mankind:

I must confess, the many virtues of those excellent quadrupeds [i.e., the Houyhnhnms] placed in opposite view to human corruptions, had so far opened my eyes and enlarged my understanding, that I began to view the actions and passions of man in a very different light, and to think the honor of my own kind not worth managing [i.e., manipulating]; . . .<sup>4</sup>

It is hard not to credit the words of a friend who evinces a yearning for ideal virtue.

I had not been a year in this country, before I contracted such a love and veneration for the inhabitants, that I entered on a firm resolution never to return to human kind, but to pass the rest of my life among these admirable Houyhnhnms in the contemplation and practice of every virtue; . . .<sup>5</sup>

Gulliver's education is coming not only to flower but to fruit. He no longer considers ways of benefiting man as he had even so recently as during his visit to the struldbrugs. The final revelation of wisdom has

<sup>1</sup> A comprehension of things means to Swift (beyond doubt) a conviction of the villainess of men as such—of their absolutely incurable villainess. So the views of Gulliver and of Swift finally coincide, though they show no identity of intellect or disposition.

<sup>2</sup> "Houyhnhnms," chaps. v and vi.

<sup>4</sup> "Houyhnhnms," chap. vii.

<sup>3</sup> "Brobdingnag," chaps. vi and vii.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

been apparently to refrain from human contact—a revelation convincing enough to transform a philanthropic Gulliver.

The full force of Gulliver's attainment of knowledge is not felt until he is forced back among men—an indubitable Yahoo. He is constrained to admit his Yahoo-nature humbly; to admit, also, that as a Yahoo he must depart the land of virtue forever.<sup>1</sup> It is only when he finally reaches England and his wife and children that the realization comes of his utter disillusion, his complete wisdom! ". . . The sight of them filled me only with hatred, disgust and contempt. . . ." <sup>2</sup> We know from our long intimacy with Gulliver that he is incapable of cruelty, hard-heartedness. We know he is not morbid or easily bored. He must have attained to whatever is the final attainment, extraordinary as the results of it may seem. From this new point of vantage (if we may so call it), Lemuel Gulliver writes to his publisher and cousin Richard Sympson that letter which forms an essential Preface to *Gulliver's Travels*—he writes condemning his own general attitude toward men in his earlier days. He protests: "I should never have attempted so absurd a project as that of reforming the Yahoo race in this kingdom; but I have now done with all such visionary schemes for ever."<sup>3</sup> These are the ultimate words from the pen of Lemuel Gulliver. He has played out his rôle to perfection. Or possibly we might say that he has gone another pilgrim's progress, this time not to the Celestial City, but to a place equally difficult of human attainment if we may believe Swift—to Misanthropolis. And the pilgrimage is real to us in the reading (if not in the after-thought) because Gulliver is in disposition and in intellect so credible, probable, recognizable, and trustworthy.<sup>4</sup>

JOHN BROOKS MOORE

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

<sup>1</sup> When Gulliver hears his doom he confesses "that I knew too well upon what solid reasons all the determinations of the wise Houyhnhnms were founded, not to be shaken by arguments of mine, a miserable Yahoo."

<sup>2</sup> "Houyhnhnms," chap. xi.

<sup>3</sup> "A Letter from Captain Gulliver to His Cousin Sympson," printed just before "A Voyage to Lilliput" in *Gulliver's Travels*.

<sup>4</sup> In calling attention to the fact that Gulliver should not be viewed merely as the representative of Swift himself or simply as the representative of mankind, I have not considered a possible view of Gulliver as a regular, undistinguished, eighteenth-century traveler. At first thought, what more plausible than that he is the conventional figure upon whom strange adventures may be hung like hats upon a hat-tree! Now no man of the period has made use of such figures more frequently than Defoe, and from his narratives we can gather just how little care had been bestowed upon travelers to make them recognizable human beings. Captain Singleton is surely a typical traveler of the time—an empty image. To compare Singleton with Gulliver is to feel the latter's individuality.

## PRECURSORS OF THE FINNISH METHOD OF FOLK-LORE STUDY

Certain general principles in the study of traditional materials are known as the Finnish or historico-geographical method. These principles were being used and even formulated into rules long before they were finally codified by Finnish scholars. This development was quite independent of the course events took in Finland, and would have led sooner or later to the creation of a rigid analytical method. It is not without interest and importance to show the nature and course of this development.

The Finnish method consists in assembling as complete a list of versions as possible,<sup>1</sup> in dividing the story into a series of episodes, in

<sup>1</sup> Of course we must not forget that assembling a complete or even relatively complete collection of versions is a very laborious undertaking and one not to be assumed lightly. In this insistence on completeness the Finnish method differs from the earlier methods generally, in so far as we can perceive any definite procedure in them. Max Müller, for example, appears to have used the versions which came to hand without searching for others. The much-talked-of psycho-analytic "method," if it can be called a method at all, is quite as casual in its selection of versions for closer study. De Keyser ("Het Lied van Halewijn; een psycho-analytisch onderzoek," *Nederlandsch Tijdschrift voor Volkskunde*, XXVII [1922], 165-74) takes a text which illustrates most strikingly the points which he wishes to make and then treats it as primitive and original without more ado. Jan de Vries ("Het Lied van Halewijn: over het goed gebruik van wetenschappelijke methoden," *ibid.*, XXVIII [1923], 1-17) calls him to order, but doubtless unavailingly. I cannot see that other psycho-analytic studies in traditional materials are better in this regard. Except for the article on "Cinderella," Saintyves (*Les contes de Perrault et les récits parallèles* [Paris, 1923]), who may be cited as representative of those seeking origins in prehistoric rituals, appears to rest his case on versions which chance to fall into his hands rather than on an exhaustive collection of materials, and for Cinderella he relies on Miss Cox's famous book. The ethnological method of Andrew Lang would, one might expect, demand completeness of its disciples. But examples of the method are hard to find, at least examples of its detailed and thorough application are practically non-existent. Lang, in his study of the Cupid and Psyche story, aims at bringing together examples of savage custom, and so does MacCulloch in his *Childhood of Fiction*. The older and the more scattering the examples the better. But a really painstaking determination of what constitutes the Cupid and Psyche story does not occur to a member of the ethnological school, although such a determination might seem to be a prerequisite to explaining the story. I cannot pass over unmentioned Karsten's review of Hästesko, *Länsisomalaiset tautien loitsut* ("West Finnish Charms against Sicknesses") in *Ze. des Vereins f. Volksk.*, XXI (1911), 426-27. Karsten says, "Die Ergebnisse, zu denen der Verf. gelangt, und die von ihm angewandte Methode sind indessen, wie mir scheint, sehr anfechtbar. Die Methode ist die in Finnland besonders von Prof. K. Krohn vertretene historisch-geographische Entlehnungsmethode, die a priori von der Voraussetzung ausgeht, dass sowohl die Zaubersprüche selbst wie die ihnen zugrunde liegenden magischen oder religiösen Vorstellungen überhaupt nichts Allgemein menschliches darstellen, sondern bei einem einzelnen Volke entstanden und von diesem allmählich durch Entlehnung zu andern gekommen seien." Two things

minutely comparing each episode's variations as found in the whole body of texts to establish a prototypic original, and in deducing from this comparison the story's wanderings. In this minute comparison as well as in the consequent deductions certain obvious, almost axiomatic principles enable us to reach our conclusions. Such is briefly the Finnish method, a method to which, as I hope to show, scholars would have come in any event. Indeed, the scholarly world was already moving inevitably toward the Finnish method, at the very time when Finnish scholars codified and standardized the procedure.

Three essential stages, viz., the collection of all the texts, the division of the theme into episodes, and the painstaking comparison of each episode's variations, are already exemplified in Grundtvig's epochal work, *Danmarks gamle Folkeviser* (1853 ff.), and with this we shall begin without inquiring whether preliminary efforts in the same direction already existed. For ballad after ballad Grundtvig systematically performs these three tasks. Yet the procedure is almost wholly descriptive; rarely and only incidentally does it attain any result or draw a deduction, however obvious. Of course no blame attaches to Grundtvig, for he intended to go no farther. In all particulars Child follows Grundtvig in collecting and editing the English and Scottish popular ballads, as have in general later ballad collectors. Just what Grundtvig and Child accomplished is clearly brought out by comparing the method of Ludwig Erk and his later editor, F. M. Böhme, in *Deutscher Liederhort* (1893 ff.) and the various collections which led up to it, or of F. van Duyse in *Het oude nederlandsche lied* (1903 ff.). In such collections we have merely the first stage of the procedure; the material is brought together with reasonable completeness. The summaries of the various similar ballads and stories are printed one after another. The decomposition of the theme into traits or episodes and the systematic comparison of the variations in each trait or episode are not undertaken.<sup>1</sup>

are here confused: the charms themselves and the magical or religious ideas which lie behind the charms. If we can show the ideas to be *allgemeinmenschlich*, we have by no means shown that the charms, which belong to a distinct and peculiar literary genre, are equally universal. How one can write the history of Finnish charms without collecting them and endeavoring to see whether each individual charm has been borrowed is more than I can say. Karsten grants that the charms are "of comparatively late origin" (*verhältnismässig späten Ursprungs*), and the concession answers his objections.

<sup>1</sup> Cosquin's method of comparison was also the juxtaposition of complete texts rather than their decomposition into traits. See, for example, his *Etudes folkloriques* (Paris, 1922).



We may now pass to discussion and illustration of the third stage of the Finnish method: the piecemeal examination of the theme. This procedure is the essence of the Finnish method. For each trait the variations are tabulated. These variations are then examined in the light of certain general principles which have the same importance as the axioms of geometry. These principles provide a firm basis for deductions regarding the story's rise and spread. Stated in general terms, a trait may suffer enlargement, contraction, or substitution.<sup>1</sup> In the list of varying traits we endeavor to find whether a particular trait can be classed under one of these three heads and in this way to determine which trait, if any, represents the original form. If no existent trait is original, we may yet be able to deduce an original trait from which all the others spring. In rare instances a definite conclusion is impossible, but this *impasse* need not terrify us until we come to it. These deductions as to the original form of the trait rest on certain axioms. The trait selected as original must conform to

<sup>1</sup> We need not be concerned by any possible difficulty in assigning a particular variation to one of these heads rather than another. That sort of thing is all a question of terms. For example, we need not insist that the replacement of a single actor by three is enlargement and not substitution or vice versa. Thus "Gil Brenton" (Child No. 5) reads as follows:

F 1. There were three sisters in a bower,  
Eh down and Oh down  
And the youngest o them was the fairest flour.  
Eh down and O down

2. And we began our seven years wark,  
To sew our brither John a sark.

3. When seven years was come and gane,  
There was nae sleeve in it but ane.

4. But we coost kevils us amang  
Wha wud to the green-wood gang.

and

H 1. We were seven sisters in a bower,  
Adown adown, and adown and adown  
The flower of a' fair Scotland ower.  
Adown adown, and adown and adown

2. We were sisters, sisters seven,  
The fairest women under heaven.

3. There fell a dispute us amang,  
Wha would to the greenwood gang.

4. They kiest the kevels them amang,  
O wha would to the greenwood gang.

Without attempting for a moment to settle what the original form may be we can see clearly that between F and H the first person has replaced the third or vice versa. But whether we call the replacement of three sisters by seven enlargement or substitution is merely a question of terms, and similarly should we regard seven as original and three as secondary, we may call the change indifferently contraction or substitution. In general, it is possible to make a satisfactory division under these three heads, which quite clearly include all possible alterations, i.e., expansion, abbreviation (including of course omission), and replacement.



some requirements, and the case for it is much strengthened if it conforms to others. The original trait must provide an explanation, mediate or immediate, of all variations as enlargements, contractions, or substitutions which are spontaneous in origin or have arisen from some definite cause. The case for the trait selected as original will be much strengthened if the trait is (1) widely known, (2) of frequent occurrence, (3) found in the oldest versions. But no one of these qualifications is a qualification essential to the acceptance of the trait as original. A trait may be widely known and not be original, and similarly it may be represented in many texts, even the oldest ones, and still not be original; but if it affords an explanation for all the varying traits, it must be original. On these obvious matters it is not necessary to dwell longer.

The principles which we have just summarized as essential to the Finnish method are implied again and again in the headnotes of Child and Grundtvig. For convenience we may select as the source of our examples the headnote to No. 4, "Lady Isabel and the Elf-Knight," which is based in the English version on the studies of Grundtvig and Bugge. Professor Child rejects a trait in the following fashion: "K and L are of the same length and the same tenor as J. There are no names in L; in K both Annele and Ulrich, but the latter is very likely to have been inserted by the editor."<sup>1</sup> No further explanation is offered for rejecting this trait, i.e., the name Ulrich. Let us supply the grounds. These are sufficient: (1) The trait does not accord with the nearly related variants J and L.<sup>2</sup> (2) The trait in K does not provide an explanation for the forms J and L. (3) An explanation for the variation in K can be found: The editor of K is notoriously careless in the handling of his texts and consequently may have inserted the name from a version lying outside the group J, K, L. We must note just what has happened here: Child has ventured to establish a parent-form for the three texts J, K, and L. This parent-form does not contain the name Ulrich. At the same time he seems to imply that the name Annele belongs to the original form, for it is found in J and K and is lost in L. The correctness or incorrectness of the reasoning

<sup>1</sup> I, 33.

<sup>2</sup> The lack of agreement among J, K, and L is evidence that some explanation is needed.

in this particular instance does not concern us, but we are much interested in observing that the Finnish method is implied at every step.

In another connection Child observes regarding German H<sup>1</sup> that "a stanza is lost between 6 and 7, which should contain the warning of the dove." No reasons are given for this assertion, and none need be, for its truth is obvious. It is sufficient to remark that the versions which contain the bird's warning cannot be derived one and all independently from a text in which such a warning is lacking. In other words, German H does not provide an explanation for the other texts and therefore cannot be original. Furthermore, we are confirmed in this belief by the facts that an easy explanation of German H's variation lies ready to hand, i.e., simple omission due to forgetfulness and (what has little value) that German H stands alone and does not have the strength of numbers behind it.

Of German M, which has three warning doves, Professor Child says, "The second and third doves, as being false prophets, and for other reasons, may be safely pronounced intruders."<sup>2</sup> He vouchsafes no details regarding the "other reasons." We can easily supply them: (1) Three doves provide an insufficient explanation for the trait's other forms. (2) Triplicate expansion of a subsidiary figure is a commonplace in traditional materials.

The remarks concerning other traits in the same ballad illustrate the Finnish method in much the same way. The names Ulinger, Oldemor, Ulrich, and the like have "likeness enough to tempt one to seek for a common original."<sup>3</sup> In other words, a widely distributed trait—and perhaps an old trait, although that qualification is nowhere specified and is not necessarily implied—is likely to be an original trait. Clearly a less important and indeed quite unessential reason is here put first. Grundtvig, whom Child is following with critical comments, should have shown first that Holofernes provides an explanation for all the diverging forms of the name; second, that no other form of the name provides so satisfactory an explanation; and third, that the case is strengthened by the age and wide distribution of names which might imply an original Holofernes. As it is, the third of these reasons stands first. Similar implications of the Finnish method are readily seen elsewhere, e.g., "The original name of the heroine has

<sup>1</sup> I, 32.

<sup>2</sup> I, 34. The italics are mine.

<sup>3</sup> I, 51.

been lost, and yet it is to be noticed that Gert Olbert's mother, in German A, is called Fru Jutte."<sup>1</sup> No reasons are given, but the implications are obviously: (1) Loss of names is a frequent phenomenon in ballad transmission. (2) German A is an old text.<sup>2</sup> The first implication involves the necessary prerequisite in establishing the original form, viz., that the form selected shall explain the trait's variations and the second implication involves the respect due an old text.

As a last illustration from this headnote we may select the following: "It is an original trait in the ballad that the murderer, *as is expressly said in many copies*, is from a foreign land."<sup>3</sup> Perhaps the possibility of deriving all the variations from this "original trait" is present by implication, but certainly the case is made to rest chiefly on the number of instances—a most precarious basis one need scarcely say.

By this time someone will have exclaimed, "But the Finnish method is only common sense!" To such a remark I should instantly agree, adding that the Finnish method is only common sense codified into a rigid procedure and not applied at random. The method deserves the epithet "Finnish" because Finnish scholars made the codification.

Thus far we have examined the Finnish method chiefly in its descriptive aspect. From the facts it reveals in the tale's history we can often arrive at conclusions regarding the tale's dissemination. In determining the place of a tale's invention we employ two fundamental principles: (1) The tale is best preserved<sup>4</sup> in its place of origin. (2) The texts show a progressive deterioration as we go farther and farther from the place of origin. These principles are to be employed with great caution, for we also know that a version which lies on the edge of the area of distribution may have kept traits which have been elsewhere lost in the eddying currents. An outlying version may therefore contain very old traits, and is at the same time almost certain to be sadly disordered.

The application of these principles is not original with Finnish

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> German A, to be sure, is not older than 1800, and I am not quite certain that its age is implied here.

<sup>3</sup> I, 51. The italics are mine.

<sup>4</sup> "Best preserved" describes those texts which have preserved traits in the original forms, which have least altered the tenor of the original story, and which have kept the significance of beliefs, customs, or superstitions implied in the story.

scholars. In an important collection of French ballads, Doncieux, for example, employs these principles in a discussion of "Donna Lombarda." He finds but one sadly disordered French text of a ballad often sung in Italy and concludes at once that the ballad is Italian in origin:

On ne l'a recueillie qu'une fois hors des frontières italiennes, en pays d'oc, sous une forme française très fruste. ... Une aire géographique aussi bien délimitée, de même que le nom caractéristique de "dona Lombarda" qui désigne le personnage principal de la chanson, ne laissent point de doute sur son lieu d'origine.<sup>1</sup>

In the same way he deduces the Scandinavian origin of "La belle Hélène ou la danseuse noyée" from the facts that the story is well preserved in Scandinavia and defective in France: "Le récit mythologique de la tradition scandinave se réduit dès lors à une historiette morale touchant les funestes effets de la désobéissance."<sup>2</sup> We need not illustrate at greater length the use of such obvious principles as these.

The progress toward the Finnish method did not stop at such suggestions and implications as have been mentioned. In both France and Germany and no doubt elsewhere studies in traditional materials had used methods belonging to the Finnish codification with more or less success. One of the last studies, perhaps even the very last, published by Gaston Paris is very instructive.<sup>3</sup> He makes a complete collection of the available material.<sup>4</sup> The older fashion of summarizing the tales one after another still constrains him,<sup>5</sup> but he concludes with a comparison of the varying traits and by this means deduces the oldest form.<sup>6</sup> The arguments used in reaching this conclusion are: (1) The form selected as original is both widely spread and frequently told. (2) It accords well with the tale's intent. (3) The variations can be explained by means of it. At a later point in his study he follows exactly the Finnish method of presenting the evidence:

Ich gebe von dem gemeinsamen Inhalte der sechs Märchen einen Auszug und verzeichne kurz die besonderen Abweichungen jedes einzelnen. Zu diesem

<sup>1</sup> *Le romanéro populaire de la France* (Paris, 1904), p. 179.

<sup>2</sup> P. 404.

<sup>3</sup> "Die undankbare Gattin," *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde*, XIII (1903), 1-24, 129-50.

<sup>4</sup> P. 1 n.

<sup>5</sup> E.g., pp. 3-8.

<sup>6</sup> E.g., pp. 8-9.

Zwecke teile ich die Geschichte in acht Abschnitte, an deren Spitze ich die Form stelle, die sich durch die Vergleichung mit den anderen als die älteste erweist.<sup>1</sup>

Further illustration is unnecessary. One or two general criticisms of the organization in Gaston Paris' essay are, however, not out of place. He arranges his material in groups of related stories. The arrangement implies a previous knowledge of the relations. In other words, he works out the whole study before writing it and thus doubles his labor. In a systematic comparison based on historical and geographical considerations such groups present themselves of their own accord; more than that, the reader would not be tempted to raise the question whether other groups could have been formed. Yet the merits of Gaston Paris' presentation, its perspicuity and strict organization, are not to be underestimated. A further difficulty arises from the necessity of going beyond the limits of the group to explain a variation, e.g., "Die Lösung ist sicher umgearbeitet, um den buddhistischen Ideen angepasst zu werden. . . . Die Uebersetzung ist deutlich. In den nicht-buddhistischen Versionen findet man die Bestrafung wieder."<sup>2</sup> I omit unnecessary details of the argument. Here he is compelled to use the non-Buddhistic texts which lie outside the group under immediate consideration. Elsewhere he could have attained his result more directly by comparison than by reliance on "obvious" deductions, e.g., "Die Art, in der dies geschieht, ist offenbar entstellt."<sup>3</sup> Even so apparent a corruption as that to which he is referring would have been made clearer by comparison, but the reader is left to seek the variants and prove the point for himself. In brief, Gaston Paris has employed the Finnish method, which he had characterized almost ten years before as "une méthode nouvelle et rigoureusement scientifique."<sup>4</sup>

As a second example of the use of the Finnish method apart from its formulation and use in Finland I select Friedrich Ranke's brilliant essay, *Der Erlöser in der Wiege* (1911). Here we find<sup>5</sup> a comparison

<sup>1</sup> P. 139.

<sup>2</sup> P. 5, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> P. 6, n. 3.

<sup>4</sup> *Journal des savants* (1894-95). He goes on to say: "Cette méthode outre qu'elle repose sur la division des contes en 'traits,' qu'avaient déjà pratiquée d'autres savants, est essentiellement 'géographique' en ce sens qu'elle s'efforce de limiter les aires dans lesquelles les contes se sont formés, se sont propagés et se sont modifiés." I quote from K. Krohn, *Die folkloristische Arbeitsmethode* (Oslo, 1926), p. 15.

<sup>5</sup> Pp. 18 ff.

of a trait's varying forms. He selects one as original and then shows<sup>1</sup> that the varying forms can be derived from it and conversely that no other form will provide a satisfactory starting-point. In a methodological Appendix<sup>2</sup> he emphasizes certain restrictions which might seem obvious: (1) The frequency with which a particular variation occurs in the collection of materials gives little or no indication as to its originality. (2) A variation's age affords equally little basis for calling it original. (3) The most nearly original form is found in a remote and inaccessible district, i.e., on the borders of the area of distribution. He lays stress on an interesting and useful fact, viz., in examining the tabulated variations of a trait, the incoherent and disordered versions are often the most important and are likely to yield significant indications of the tale's meaning, origin, and development. Such confused versions may represent a transitional stage between an obscured and partially understood *Urform* and a better-ordered, more intelligible, but later form. The abundant and well-told versions may have arisen from a systematization of the story.

The Finnish method is therefore a procedure which was already being employed elsewhere and which, if it had not been formulated by Finnish scholars, would have found formulation sooner or later in France or Germany. Yet the codification was itself so significant a step forward that we shall not begrudge the Finns the method's name. It is not out of place to comment on two disputed corollaries which Antti Aarne entangled with the Finnish method and which have properly nothing to do with the method's application. In his codification, *Leitfaden der vergleichenden Märchenforschung*, Aarne asserted that European *märchen* were invented at a late stage of human culture and, in particular, in the Middle Ages.<sup>3</sup> The assertion may or may not be true, but in any event it does not concern the method. His phrasing of the assertion is very cautious and should not have called forth as much contradiction as it has. In the same book<sup>4</sup> and in his studies he made a very unfortunate distinction between versions from literary sources and versions from the folk. This distinction has caused a tremendous turmoil.<sup>5</sup> Scholars have rushed to the defense of the "liter-

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 32 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 73 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *FF Communications*, XIII, 18.

<sup>4</sup> Pp. 18 ff.

<sup>5</sup> See particularly A. Wesselski, *Märchen des Mittelalters*, pp. xi ff., and K. Krohn, *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, XXVI (1925), 111 ff.



ary" variants. Here again the dispute centers on a detail quite beside the main issue. A "literary" variant is capable of more definite interpretation and evaluation than a version from the folk. A tale in Boccaccio's *Decameron* has been subjected to more or less readily definable cultural influences which can be taken into account, while a tale from the folk must be accepted for what it is worth without much attempt at evaluation. In general, we can recognize the effects of certain cultural influences and of literary adaptation in the literary tale, while we cannot readily see them in the folk-tale. Of course the distinction is relative, and unfortunately the emphasis in theory and practice has rested a little too strongly on the special treatment of "literary" variants.

Aarne and the Finnish method have been accused of simply counting the variations in a trait and selecting that one which was in the majority. It is true that his works seem to justify this criticism. Moreover, Walter Anderson's masterly study of "King John and the Abbot of Canterbury"<sup>1</sup> continues in the same manner and indeed goes farther by giving percentages for each variation in relation to the total number of variations. Of course such reliance on numerical superiority is entirely erroneous, and neither Aarne nor Anderson are guilty of it. The skill of both scholars and their thorough familiarity with popular tradition kept them from errors into which one less competent might have fallen. The percentages in Anderson's study seem quite beside the point, but an important corollary implicit in them will be drawn a little later.

By way of summary and conclusion we can show the Finnish method's slow development in the more important studies of traditional materials since 1850.<sup>2</sup> Grundtvig and Child insisted on the first essential stage in the Finnish method: a complete collection of the evidence. This they accomplished. Both ballad editors examined the individual traits or episodes and tabulated the variations. This task they did not accomplish completely, and they apparently made no effort looking toward completeness. Some details are tabulated, others are not, and chance seems to determine a trait's fate in this regard. The Finnish method, on the contrary, insists upon tabulating all varia-

<sup>1</sup> *FF Communications*, XLII.

<sup>2</sup> Nils Lid's interesting essay, "Wilhelm Mannhardt og hans nyskaping av den folkloristiske metoden," *Syn og Segn* (1925), might seem to be of significance here, but it deals with quite other problems.



tions and studying them carefully. Certain variations can be rejected as meaningless, since they are plausibly and immediately explicable as spontaneous in origin, e.g., those variations which have arisen by the substitution of one for three, of white for black, or the like. Into the remaining variations we can usually bring order by finding some prototypic form out of which the existing forms can be derived, if need be, by reference to a more complex set of associations. Such is Aarne's method, and such is the Finnish method, but it has a defect which Aarne did not trouble to remedy. Aarne does not formally insist on the complete examination of all variations, and his works do not show that he required the hypothetical prototypic form to supply an explanation for all the varying traits. We have seen the significance of this complete examination of the versions in Ranke's study where it is pointed out that any single variation is as valuable and as likely to be the original source as any other. The examination of all variations is implied in Anderson's percentages, although he nowhere makes any remark about this detail in his procedure. Of course it is quite unnecessary to convert the figures into percentages; it would have sufficed to add up the variants each time and find that all were accounted for. A corollary to what has just been said is this: We must take into account those variations in which a trait is absent, for absence is a variation quite as important as any other.<sup>1</sup>

By way of conclusion we may summarize the steps in the Finnish method in its present application: (1) the complete collection of the versions; (2) the division of the story into traits or episodes; (3) the minute comparison of the variations in trait or episode while recognizing (4) that the absence of a trait is a variation to be accounted for; (5) the deduction of a prototypic form which must supply an explanation for all variations in the traits.<sup>2</sup> Such tabulation and critical examination may teach us the tale's dissemination and history as revealed by its progressive decay or transformation. To such a procedure as this the scholarly world was rapidly and inevitably coming at the very time when rules were being drawn up in Finland.

ARCHER TAYLOR

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

<sup>1</sup> Taylor, *FF Communications*, LXX (1927), 9.

<sup>2</sup> Not an exception is admissible. The kinds of explanations which are likely to be employed are described at length in Aarne, "Leitfaden der vergleichenden Märchenforschung," *FF Communications*, XIII, 23 ff.; K. Krohn, *Die folkloristische Arbeitsmethode*, pp. 59 ff.



## REVIEWS

---

*An Introduction to Old Norse.* By E. V. GORDON, professor of English language in the University of Leeds. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927; New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch. Pp. lxxxiv+383. \$3.50.

The core of this textbook consists of one hundred and sixty-five pages of well-chosen Old Scandinavian text, chiefly Icelandic, but with specimens of Norwegian, Danish, and Swedish, and of sixty pages of grammar. Accompanying this is a generous cultural, historical, and literary introduction, extensive notes to the texts, a section on runes, glossary, maps, illustrations, and a general bibliography. The beginner gets in one book what he would otherwise have to search for in many books in various languages. The author covers a wide field; he is well informed on his subject, and it is to be regretted that the world of Scandinavian scholarship has heard so little from him, for he has given us an attractive book, packed with information both for beginners and for those who have already made progress.

The reviewer feels strongly that Professor Gordon should have given either much less space to sound-changes, or considerably more. He explains certain changes and briefly dismisses or ignores many that will strike the student's eye and cause him to conclude that phonological laws have but limited application. Thus, no explanation is given of the cause of *i*-mutation in comparatives and superlatives, or in many instances of the sounds which cause the changes in root-vowels of nouns. An account of the inflectional endings in Germanics is needed for the latter. Although Professor Gordon frames his statements with fine precision they are sometimes cryptic by reason of brevity, as in his statement of *i*-mutation in § 35, of the loss of *j* in § 62, of the origin of *-ggj-* in § 65, in his comment on *vetr* in § 77, and elsewhere.

The inclusion of so much illustrative material from Old English is very helpful, but it is to be regretted that Gothic is ignored and that Primitive Germanic is so rarely employed for explanation; in many cases a Gothic form would have clarified and shortened the statement.

In the principal parts of strong verbs the third plural of the past is given, instead of the first plural, as is the present usage in all other scientific grammars of Germanic dialects. Why go out of the way to destroy a uniformity helpful to students because Vigfusson and Powell were not uniform at a time when uniformity was not so well established?

I leave the matter of misprints to another reviewer. Would not 'rise' and 'fall' be a better translation of *Hebung* and *Senkung* than 'lift' and 'sinking'?

The author speaks (p. xxxix) of the "slow rhythm and emphasis of Norse speech." None of the modern Scandinavian languages sounds slow to me, least of all Icelandic. I doubt if the older language was slow.

The chapter on "Norse Studies in England" is useful, but a chapter on Scandinavian studies in general, with emphasis on the Scandinavian and German scholars who have created our science, would have been more useful.

From the prefatory note on page 111 it seems that Professor Gordon regards the story of Auðun as historical. Of course no one can prove that it is not, but he who reads *Von einem schretel und von einem wazzerbern* in *ZfdA*, VI, 174-84, will hardly regard it as historical. It is more probably a motive from the tale represented by Aarne, No. 1161. It is characteristic of the way Icelandic literature treats traditional tales. In emphasizing the absence of exaggeration in the sagas, Professor Gordon neglects to make an exception of the *Fornaldarsögur*, which he had just cited (p. xxxiii).

The author speaks (p. 182) of the *æsir* and elves in heaven. If he means Valhöll why not say so? On page xxxi he says: "Every religious-minded man of the heathen age believed that he existed for the sake of that hopeless cause," i.e., to fight the wolf at the final destruction. Scholars no longer believe that the Othinic tales formed any part of popular religion. Moreover, what was a "religious-minded man of the heathen age"? He was a man who had a good stock of magical means for averting unpleasant events. The author combines Christian concepts with the inventions of ancient poets into something that never was.

Similarities of poetic technique and diction in different Germanic dialects are attributed to descent from a common Germanic tradition (pp. xxxvi and 227). This is a dangerous supposition in view of the thousands of years which have intervened since the separation of the Scandinavians from the other Germanic peoples. Would it not be more reasonable to explain such agreements by social contacts favored by similarity of speech?

The title, *Introduction to Old Norse*, means to the author "Introduction to Old Scandinavian," and he subdivides "Old Norse" into Old Icelandic, Old Norwegian, Old Danish, and Old Swedish. I am well aware that he has the best of lexical authority for this, but it is a bad practice and followed by few. The most of us regard Old Norse as equivalent to Old Norwegian and a Norseman as a Norwegian. People also hazily refer to Old Icelandic as Old Norse, a usage to which Professor Gordon objects. This latter is simply a translation of *gammel Norsk* used for Icelandic by superheated Norwegian patriots of the sixties and seventies, a phrase to which other Scandinavians objected. Professor Gordon fails to use his terminology correctly (pp. xx, xxii, xxiv, and elsewhere), and repeatedly uses "Norse" for "West Scandinavian" when referring to Icelandic and Norwegian poetry. His terms do not readily lend themselves to exact statements. Since the term "Old Norse" detracts from clarity, it would be better to dispense with it and speak of Old

Scandinavian, East Scandinavian, West Scandinavian, Old Icelandic, Old Norwegian, Old Swedish, Old Danish.

There is another objection which goes much deeper than any of the foregoing: This book does not lead the student to the noble adventure of mental initiative; it prepares him to pass an examination. The author does not suggest problems, the grammar gives no references to further literature on the subjects discussed, and rarely indicates that there is more than one view of a question. For instance, the student is not informed that few scholars accept Kock's *-iR* mutation, or that Sievers no longer regards his five-type system of versification as a dominant norm. Thus certain things look much simpler in this book than they really are. In general it answers the question "What?" much better than the question "Why?"; but the latter is the question which should continually face our students. Otherwise the inquiring mind will be driven to stop questioning.

In spite of such objections as these, I consider it a good book, and I shall put it into the hands of my students.

CHESTER NATHAN GOULD

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*A Bibliography of Writings on the English Language.* By A. G. KENNEDY. Cambridge and New Haven: Harvard Press and Yale Press, 1927. Pp. ix+517.

It has been justly said that "there is no man of letters who deserves better of the community than the compiler of a good index." With what greater praise shall we commend the man of letters who in the same year publishes one good index and whose name is recorded upon the title-page as the joint author of another? This is the year's service to scholarship of Professor Kennedy with his *Bibliography* and Tatlock and Kennedy's *Concordance to the Complete Works of Chaucer*. The cause of scholarship is at present in greater need of such reliable bibliographies and such competent indexes than it is of new theories and startling discoveries. Happily enough, in the past few months other compilations of high value to scholarly studies have appeared; notably, Pollard and Redgrave's *Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland . . . , 1475-1642*, the third supplement to Wells's *Manual of Writings in Middle English*, Crane and Kaye's *Census of British Newspapers and Periodicals, 1620-1800*, and the last volume of Caroline Spurgeon's *Chaucer Criticism and Allusion*. These aids in lightening the mechanical labor of the scholar are, however, valuable to the student of the English language only incidentally; and the pursuit of research in this field of study has been in greater need of comprehensive and trustworthy bibliographical aid than that in the history of literature. The emphasis placed upon the study of the English language in the second half of the nineteenth century and in

the years of the twentieth up to the outbreak of the Great War produced an overwhelming amount of printed matter, the greater part of which appeared in fugitive form as dissertation, program, and journal article. A full finding-list of this material has heretofore not been available. Professor Kennedy's publication of a guide to it comes to students of the English language as a blessing from Heaven—and from Stanford University and the Harvard and Yale presses.

A bibliography should at least be complete (within its specified limits), accurate, well ordered, conveniently and fully indexed. These requirements Kennedy's *Bibliography* meets with a high average of attainment.

For sufficiently good practical reasons the compiler was forced to place some limitation upon the term "English language." He chose to exclude studies of versification and literary style, the mass of nineteenth- and twentieth-century school rhetorics and composition manuals, and modern elementary grammars and dictionaries. With this material cast aside, Kennedy sought to furnish a complete record of all printed material of any value to the student of the general history of the English language or of any particular field of it. The index-items run from Caxton's *Prefaces* to the end of 1922. That the record should be absolutely complete in its thirteen thousand titles is a hope that goes beyond any sane person's confidence in human frailty. It certainly goes far beyond the modest denial of the author of any claim to infallibility. He rightly prophesies that "specialists in any part of the field will no doubt be able to supplement the material" in any one of his sections. I have checked carefully the section devoted to "Old English Syntax," a field in which I have for several years collected bibliographical items. Of the more than four hundred gatherings which I had made, I find that Kennedy has omitted three fairly unimportant titles.<sup>1</sup> The section concerned with foreign and English grammars to about 1650 might with profit have been materially added to; but it is a field of important study which has received from no one the attention which it deserves.

In the large scope of Kennedy's book, errors, too, are unescapable. I feel confident, however, that when all the returns are in, after the book has been in use for some time, an unusually high degree of reliability will be placed upon it. One or two misstatements are due to the author's use of secondary bibliographical sources, a use which he is always careful to indicate; for example, 1541 as the date of Hollyband's *Treatise for Declining Verbs* instead of 1580, an error carried over from Hazlitt, and the initials "N. G." for George Delamothe (*A French Alphabet*, 1592), taken from the *Library of Congress Catalogue*. Professor Kennedy invites co-operative effort in tracing any errors which may be found in his index in order to better the foundation he has

<sup>1</sup> T. J. Farrar, *The Gerund in Old English* (Baltimore, 1902); L. Erckmann, *Infinitive and Gerund as a Means of Abbreviating Substantive Sentences in the English Language* (Luenburg: Rostock Diss., 1875); L. Walter, *Der syntaktische Gebrauch des Verbums in dem angelsächsischen Gedichte "Christ und Satan"* (Rostock Diss., 1907).

securely laid for a "work of such accuracy and comprehensiveness as shall satisfy the most exacting requirements." Else what's a heaven—or a first edition—for?

The material is well ordered and conveniently arranged. The thirteen thousand titles are listed under ten large sections, half a hundred subsections, under the majority of which fall several smaller classes, descending from the most general to special books and articles. Within the divisions the separate items are placed, as far as is practicable, in chronological order. Overminute classification has fortunately been avoided; but where it has not been carried far enough to provide an exclusive category for every item, double and triple reference has been used—much to my satisfaction—and cross-reference has been carefully provided. Thus the way of the bibliography-seeker has been made plain. It has been made easy, too, by the preparation of an Author Index of some seven thousand names and of a Subject Index of more than three hundred and fifty topics, both of which in a fairly familiar use of the book I have found reliable.

With the aid of Kennedy's *Bibliography* we are now in a position to turn our glance backward and observe what we so far have accomplished and to plan what we shall undertake. The sowers have sown abundantly; the harvest has been gathered; the wheat must be separated from the chaff—and of the chaff the crop is large. The most pressing challenge of the index is its invitation to the preparation of a history of English language study.

JAMES F. ROYSTER

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

---

*The Wandering Scholars.* By HELEN WADDELL. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1927. \$5.00. Pp. xxviii+292.

Miss Waddell's brilliant study of the wandering scholars and their background is one of those books which are the delight and the despair of scholars. Not since John Addington Symonds' *Wine, Women, and Song* has any body of comment and translation from the Medieval Latin appeared so glowingly depicting the human and humane values which lie buried in the *corpus* of Latin verse from decaying paganism to the *Carmina Burana*. Especially notable are the chapters on "The Ordo Vagorum" and "The Scholars' Lyric." Miss Waddell is brilliantly right in her insistence that the body of pagan culture did not vanish with Boethius to reappear miraculously with Petrarch, though, curiously enough, she seems to have missed the *De vera religione* of the thirteenth century, discovered by J. W. Thompson, which would have triumphantly rounded off her work.

When there is so much that is vital and moving, it is unfortunate that Miss Waddell should not be a safer guide. Her difficulty lies in her very virtue. She is so insistent that we shall see medieval scholars as men, she forgets



that they were both scholars and medieval. Not only does she incessantly dramatize her facts, but she is perpetually pointing a modern instance. In the space of ten pages we are told that Fortunatus "wanders through the terrifying courts of the giants, a little like Gulliver"; that he loved Radegunde and Agnes "as Cowper loved Mrs. Unwin and Lady Heskith"; that "no renaissance tyrant, no Jew of Malta" gloried in jewels as did he; that "he loves good cheer and country things as Herrick did"; that Jerome behaved "very like Dr. Johnson"; and so on. Such statements are usually extreme, and often misleading. As style it is wearisome; and what is worse, it points to a profound misconception of the medieval mind.

Let us take a single instance. In what earthly sense (or heavenly, for that matter) can the mystic love of Fortunatus for Radegunde be compared with Cowper's mild, domestic affection for Mrs. Unwin? The whole distance between Catholicism and Protestantism, the whole distance between mysticism and domestic love, the whole distance between Gregory the Great and Rev. John Newton separates the two instances. And it is not merely as a slip that one objects to this sort of thing; it is the radical defect of Miss Waddell's brilliant book that she misreads and misrepresents the Middle Ages. For, a little after these unfortunate remarks on Fortunatus, we read of his marriage verses on Chilperic and his bride, "One could have spared the felicitations of Fortunatus on that occasion, but he was a courtier poet." Precisely. Miss Waddell can spare these verses, but they cannot be spared from the total picture of the literary activity of the very scholars she is describing. They are a vital part of the story.

For the vast Latin literature from 500 to 1400 contains, besides the human-interest passages of Miss Waddell's delight, a hundred times as much that is not "human" and not modern, but distinctly medieval. This aspect of the story does not appear in her volume. One can read her discussion of the Carolingian scholars and scarcely suspect that the interminable tomes of the *Poetae Karoli Aevi* are, unless sifted, a weariness of the flesh, a stupendous compound of bad verse, of dull homily, of empty panegyric, of monotonous elegy, of abecedaria and acrostic and anagram and palindrome, of edifying discourse and endless sermon and monkish chronicle and versified stale small-beer. One can read what she has to say about the lyrics of the *Latin Anthology*, and, unless he has read Brinkmann's article (*Neophilologus*, Vol. IX, 1924) never suspect that the amatory lyrics she praises are perfectly set pieces, falling into three types repeated over and over.<sup>1</sup> To remark as she does that "the romantic quality in Latin" captured the imagination of the Middle Ages is surely to misread the medieval belief that the story of Aeneas

<sup>1</sup> Incidentally, when Miss Waddell speaks of a "score of lovely lyrics buried in the anthologies of the sixth and ninth and tenth centuries" (p. xxii), the first lines of some of which she then quotes, the reader will scarcely discover that most of her lyrics do not belong to the sixth, ninth, and tenth centuries, but have been unhesitatingly ascribed to Petronius Arbiter. Miss Waddell undoubtedly knows this, but she is too eager in her picture-building to remember that the reader does not know it.

was authentic history. To write that "the last three centuries of the Empire" form "the spiritual foundations" of medieval Europe is true, but it is not true as Miss Waddell writes it, for she ignores the vast in-pouring of Eastern mysticism, Plotinian philosophy, Judaic allegorizing and theology, Byzantine conventionality, Arabian science, and love-lore of these and subsequent centuries; they do not figure in her book. In sum, selected details give a clever picture of the medieval scholar, but it is not always a true picture; and as the doubts begin to crowd upon the informed reader—as rash generalization and impassioned interpretation confront him, as he is informed for the tenth time that something or other medieval is the greatest of its kind<sup>1</sup>—he is inclined to put the book aside with impatience.

But if Miss Waddell has, as I think, constructed a picture of the medieval scholars in which everything is in high-lights and there are no shadows, if she moves among Latin texts in a state of perpetual amazement, she is none the less tonic. Her translations are always competent and often superb. For the general reader she opens a world as undiscovered by most as was America when the *Carmina Burana* was written down. She will be read with delight, but she must be read with perpetual caution.

HOWARD MUMFORD JONES

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

*Jahrbuch für historische Volkskunde.* Edited by WILHELM FRAENGER.  
Vol. II. Berlin: Herbert Stubenrauch, 1926. Pp. 216. Illustrated.

This is the second of a series of annuals devoted to the study of folk-lore, its history, sources, literature, and art. The first volume, which appeared in 1925,<sup>2</sup> dealt with the methods and principles of modern research in this field. It is proposed in the second volume to present a handbook for the history of folk-art. To this end the articles are arranged in three groups, covering the theoretical background, the practical questions of scientific organization of the objects studied, and finally a detailed description and evaluation of specific folk-art, intended to direct attention to its positive aspects. At the end, plans for the exhibit of folk-art in 1929 at Dresden are outlined. The critical Bibliography is a very valuable addition to a handbook of this sort.

The theoretical portion contains articles by Alfred Vierkandt, Hans Prinzhorn, and Arthur Haberlandt. They at once dismiss the old but nevertheless widespread theory that art, having absolute standards of value, must have existed, in primitive groups and among "common" people, in a form es-

<sup>1</sup> For instance, "Liutprand tells us . . . the liveliest history that has ever been written" (p. 76). Hroswitha's *Drusiana* "antedates by some centuries the discovery of romantic passion" (p. 79). Aldhelm's *Carm. Rhythm.* "Swinburne would be hard put to it to beat" (p. 38). Ausonius "breaks into one of the loveliest lyric measures of the ancient world" (p. 10). The Archpoeta "has the diabolic rhyming of *Don Juan*, the Ariel lightness of *Iolanthe*, and he made his own tunes: Gilbert and Sullivan in one" (p. 153). The *Carmina Burana* is "the last flowering of the Latin tongue" (p. 208).

<sup>2</sup> Reviewed by Professor A. Taylor, *Modern Philology* (Feb., 1927), p. 372.

essentially different from that of great art (*Stilkunst*). The more modern principles of individuality and of the influence of cultural environment, applied in all the social sciences, have here at last penetrated the field of folk-lore. Hans Prinzhorn, attempting to analyze the original experience (*Urvorgang*) of pictorial representation, concludes that this, bereft of any metaphysical implications, is simply an urge for the expression of some inner state. The desire may be playful, it may be ornamentative, or simply illustrative. Its application is determined by the background of the individual's general outlook on life and by the foreground of his immediate environment. Arthur Haberlandt, in the article "Begriff und Wesen der Volkskunst," has, justly, attempted to reject the false distinction between *Stilkunst* which is determined by individual personalities and *Volkskunst* which is determined by group personality, putting in its place a more positive viewpoint toward folk-art. He maintains that the individual executes the artistic purpose in folk-art as well as in *Stilkunst*. But he does not carry his idea to its logical conclusion, namely, to the elimination of the term *Volkskunst* entirely and to a consideration of every artistic expression from the standpoint of the individual artist. There would then be no essential difference between an artist who is a peasant and one who happens to live in an urban society. Both would be artists in the true sense of the word. The question whether the term *Volkskunst* has any real significance needs to be considered before the work in it moves merily on.

Following the general theoretical inquiries, there is a comparative study of European folk-art by Michael Haberlandt. He indicates how forms and motifs are scattered through certain geographical areas, and are not necessarily confined to one country. Of similar nature is the purely descriptive article by Wilhelm Pessler, "Grundzüge zu einer Sachgeographie der deutschen Volkskunst." The latter urges a more detailed study of forms in architecture and art according to their regional distribution, and inserts maps indicating what may be done. E. Hoffmann-Krayer gives practical suggestions on the work of museums for comparative folk-lore. The type of thing that should be displayed and the standpoint of the collector are clearly brought out.

In the three detailed investigations, on the significance of mythology in peasant art, on Swedish peasant painting, and on Russian art, the positive value of folk-art is again stressed. Here, also, it is regarded not simply as a degenerate form of *Stilkunst*, but is taken as a new and individual synthesis for which individual standards of judgment exist. The excellent illustrations contribute to the value of this section. The most interesting article, to me, in this group is the one by Wilhelm Fraenger on Russian picture sheets of the eighteenth century. The author shows that, although these pictures were copied from German *Stilkunst* by peasant artists, they are genuine works of art because in each case the artist followed his own interpretation of the sub-

ject, which rested upon a very definite, unified idea of style. The lack of perspective and the naïveté of linear composition are to Fraenger characteristic of the serious, realistic, neutral attitude of the peasant. In the same way he shows how a Dürer etching, imitated in both *Stilkunst* and *Volkskunst*, had degenerated in the former because it was not re-created, but had attained genuine artistic merit in *Volkskunst* because the imitation lay in subject matter, not form. The characteristic folk-touch is, according to Fraenger, again the strict epic informativeness, rather than plastic, dramatic force as in the etching. What Fraenger does not stress and what is most important in the consideration of these picture sheets is the fact that, in every case, the emphasis was laid by the artist upon the composition, the linear design. This alone accounts for the apparently neutral, abstract presentation of the subject. The artist was not primarily interested in adapting his style to the style of the biblical version of the story, as Fraenger maintains (p. 170). His artistic purpose far outweighs any literary value that may be placed upon the picture. In artistic synthesis the Russian picture surpasses the Dürer etching, even if we take into account the difference in force of perception. This artist cannot draw a line without giving it significance in the totality. The ships are not in the picture to convey the idea of sea, but they are essential to the design—they balance the kneeling figure at the right, and afford a contrast in rhythmic curves to the sharp diagonal across the picture. In point of design and composition the Russian picture stands high as art. This is the essential fact. Behind the artistic phenomenon we need not seek a naïve mind nor a "folk" mind in contrast to a highly trained artistic temperament. We need seek only an individual mind, an individual artistic experience, just as in the art of well-known masters.

FRIEDA BACHMANN

VASSAR COLLEGE

---

*Studien über den Gebrauch des Partizips in Goethe's Dichtersprache.* By

KLARA TRENKLER. Dissertation. "Seminar für germanische Philologie an der Universität Warschau. Polen. Krakowskie Przedm.," Nos. 26-28. Warsaw, 1927.

Starting with a remark by Goethe that the particular function of participles is not to fix relations definitely in the mind but to suggest them generally to the imagination, Dr. Klara Trenkler states as the purpose of her dissertation not statistical enumeration of the different grammatical types of participles detached from their literary relations, but investigation of Goethe's literary intentions in his use of this form. She divides Goethe's work into three periods: before Weimar, "Epoche der ersten Bildung"; 1776 to the time of Reineke Fuchs, "Epoche des eigentümlichen Strebens"; and after Reineke Fuchs, "Epoche des Gelangens zum Ziel. Anzeichen der sinkenden Kraft neben

der höchsten Vollendung. Verjüngung." This division is in agreement with the generally accepted opinion—an opinion, which to the mind of the reviewer, is open to the criticism, that, by implication, it fails to do justice to the originality and quality of the work of the years 1771-76; and that the exclusive attribution of "highest perfection" to the poetic works of the last period is based on a standard of values largely irrelevant to poetry. This is, however, not intended as reflecting upon the value of Miss Trenkler's study.

The characteristic function of the participle in the first period is shown by Dr. Trenkler as "Bereicherung und Verstärkung der Handlungsbegriffe." Her selections of examples will surprise even those intimately acquainted with Goethe, by the remarkable boldness, richness, and creative power in his early use and formations of participles. The present participle predominates in this period, in which action, impulsive response to the present, predominates over reflection.

The second period is characterized by a loss of boldness and active energy, by the growth of reflection and the beginning of a conscious tendency toward smoothness, correctness, regularity, harmonious rhetoric, and adoption of classic Greek types of compound participles. Participial nouns increase, revealing Goethe's growing inclination toward typification. Original formations are now rare.

In the last period, the use of the participle chiefly as a means of stylistic economy and brevity displaces the original use of it as a vehicle of abundant imaginative energy and diversity. Participial nouns, "classic" composites, future, or passive, participles increase. A distinct purpose to improve the German language becomes apparent.

The dissertation is an exemplary study. It is properly selective; it avoids both the literary futility of the grammatical method and the pitfalls of subjectivity and speculative extravagance by which the badly misnamed "idealistic neophilology" is threatened. It gives a clear and convincing account of important lines of development in Goethe's mind.

MARTIN SCHÜTZKE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

## BRIEFER MENTION

---

### THOMAS FREDERICK CRANE, 1844-1927

Few American philologists initiated work in so many and so widely separated fields as did Thomas Frederick Crane. Notwithstanding its variety, his work is singularly excellent and important; after nearly half a century even the oldest portions remain a substantial contribution to knowledge, works of reference to which all must turn. In other and more personal ways he also demands our respect. No one, I dare say, has so nearly spanned a century of scholarly activity. At the beginning, he touched hands with the founders of Romance philology, for he carried a letter from Ticknor to Diez when he went to study in Germany. At the end, he was in contact with the men who developed the new scientific study of folk-lore, Giuseppe Pitrè, Kaarle Krohn, and Antti Aarne. His openness to new ideas and his ability to organize and accomplish made him a good executive in life and in scholarship. More or less accidental circumstances brought him to Cornell University, and there he remained throughout a long and active life.

In 1883 he printed, in the *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, a short but fundamental paper on medieval tales; seven years later, the *Exempla* of Jaques de Vitry appeared. This work, now reissued by the British Folk-Lore Society in an anastatic reprint, became at once and remains the standard work on the subject. The importance of the illustrative stories used in medieval sermons had been recognized by Karl Goedeke, and the collections had been used in desultory fashion by Hermann Oesterley and others. Professor Crane set forth their significance, provided a survey of the whole field which no one has improved upon in the forty years since, and printed the texts with abundant critical and comparative notes. The full value of his work in this field is yet to be appreciated.

Along with his investigation of *exempla* he undertook the publication of *Italian Popular Tales* (1885), an anthology of Italian *märchen* with exhaustive comparative notes. This gives a selection of the best and most characteristic tales that had been printed, with complete citation of the Italian parallels. This sensible limitation of his endeavors to what could actually be accomplished with approximate completeness is characteristic of the man. His book has permanent value, while many another which aimed at doing more amounted to less and is now forgotten. This attempt to survey a nation's stock of popular literature had no imitators for a decade. Ten years later, Joseph Jacobs attempted the same thing for other countries, but could not resist the



temptation to alter his sources. Another dozen years elapsed and the idea was taken up by the publishing-house of Diederichs in Jena, in the series "Märchen der Weltliteratur," and this proved an enormously successful venture.

Upon his substantial contributions to French literary history of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries I shall not venture to touch. These studies occupy the middle period of his scholarly activities, the decade of the nineties. Along with them he printed an attractive anthology of French folk-song.

After his retirement, he completed an exhaustive study of *Italian Social Customs* (1920), which showed him to be quite abreast of modern movements in scholarship with its interest in cultural and social backgrounds. A younger scholar might have hesitated to enter a field so beset with bibliographical difficulties.

About this time, his interest in folk-lore studies manifests itself in the reviews of "FF Communications"; these brought this invaluable series to the attention of American scholars. It is interesting that the full appreciation in Finland itself of Antti Aarne's fundamental studies and his election to a professorship in the University of Helsingfors are due directly to these reviews. This is but one example of his suggestive and important reviews and gives a glimpse of one side of his work which might be overlooked in a hasty appraisal.

His last important work was the editing of the *Liber de Miraculis Beatae Virginis Mariae* (1925), which, along with Mussafia's essays in the Vienna *Sitzungsberichte*, will remain the foundation for future studies. In the prefatory note he alludes to the difficulties with which he struggled in finding channels for publication. He saw the opportunities for scholarly publication grow from restricted space in the *Nation* to our present abundance of philological journals. Against these difficulties and under the burdens of executive duties Professor Crane displayed a single-hearted devotion to scholarship which remains an inspiration to us.—A.T.

---

In Erich Maschke's *Studien zu Waffennamen der althochdeutschen Glossen* (dissertation; Greifswald, 1926; 72 pp.) the textual and linguistic discussions (words for 'helmet,' 'byrnie,' and 'buckler') are brief but very well done. The raisin in the pudding is the explanation (p. 19) of Gl K *uecticalia*, Ra *uentigalia*: *nasahelmes* (Ahd. Gl., I, 263, 28): "*nasa helmes* übersetzt also ein nach Ansicht des Glossators aus *vectis galeae* entstandenes *vectigalia*. . . . Der Schreiber der ersten Handschrift verstand das lateinische Wort, wie es der Glossator ausgedeutet hatte, nicht, sonst hätte er nicht *-galia* durch *-calia* ersetzt. Der Kopist der zweiten Handschrift hat aber wahrscheinlich *vectigalia* in seiner lateinischen Bedeutung erkannt, die Verdeutschung aber liess ihn eine andere lateinische Bildung vermuten, weshalb er sich an die vorhergehen-



den Lemmen *ventilabrum*, *ventilaturium* anschloz." The weakness of this explanation lies in the somewhat unlikely twist of the error attributed to the original glossator; this error was better accounted for (but the lemma of Gl K left up in the air) by C. Hofmann, *Germania*, IX, 228: "Der Glossator hat *ventigalia* für *ventalia* (Luftlöcher des Helmes) genommen. . . . *Ventalia* ist ein gemeinromanisches Wort, prov. *ventalha*, franz. *ventaille*. . . . *Nasahelm* wird dem mittell. *nasale*, altfr. *nasel* entsprechen." Only, we must correct Hofmann's translation of *ventalia* to 'Nasenband' and, with Maschke, read *nasa helmes*.

To each linguistic comment Maschke adds a Shandean farrago (crammed with varied and abstruse citations) anent the archaeology and history of the utensil. I cannot say whether or not these elaborations offer anything new to archaeologist or historian; if they do, it is a shame to hide them in a linguistic essay on glosses.—L. B.

The Oxford University Press (American Branch) published last year a new edition of the Middle English *Floris and Blancheflour*, edited by Professor A. B. Taylor. This volume, which is uniform with Tolkien and Gordon's *Sir Gawain*, contains a concise Introduction, the text, a small body of notes, and a Glossary. It is intended, evidently, for school use and competes in no way with Hausknecht's or Mac Knight's editions. Though it uses as a basis one of the poorer manuscripts, the edition performs a service in making this version available in an inexpensive form and with enough apparatus to facilitate the reading of the text.—J. R. H.

Professor H. C. Wyld has prepared a third edition of his useful *Short History of English* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1927). This volume contains fifty pages more than the first edition, and the sections on Middle English have been largely re-written. Professor Wyld gives here the new division of Middle English dialects which he and his pupils have worked out, largely on the evidence of place-names. As the evidence on which the classification has been made has not yet been published in full, it is impossible for a scholar who has not engaged in the work with Professor Wyld to judge its validity. But from the account which he gives of his careful methods, it seems reasonable to suppose that the classification represents an actual advance in the study of Middle English. At any rate, students of the English language will be glad to have a systematic statement of Professor Wyld's results together with a concise, exact, and up-to-date survey of the history of sounds and inflection, in this handy form.—J. R. H.

No portion of the Romance territory of Gaul has been more thoroughly explored linguistically than the region occupied by the ancient Belgae, and of the two grand divisions of this territory it is the eastern, the Walloon, which

seems to lead. As early as 1856, a *Société liégeoise de Littérature wallonne* was founded, and this body, after publishing fifteen volumes of preliminary studies (the "Bulletin du Dictionnaire," from 1906 on), has just sent to press the first fascicle of a *Dictionnaire wallon*, for which about a million slips have been assembled. The subtitle, *Glossaire général des Patois romans de Belgique*, indicates the scope of this monumental work. The same society has also undertaken an *Atlas linguistique de la Wallonie*. Dissatisfaction with the Walloon material given by Gilliéron, *Atlas linguistique de la France*, centers upon the fewness of the localities studied, their too great distance apart, and upon errors of detail. In 1920, the Belgian government founded at Liège a chair of Walloon dialectology, now occupied by J. Haust, author of a noteworthy volume, *Etymologies wallonnes et françaises* (Liège and Paris, 1923, pp. 353), and of a more recent *Dictionnaire des Rimes, ou Vocabulaire liégeois-français* (Liège, 1927, pp. 352). J. Haust quotes with approval an opinion, formulated by J. Jud and seconded by Ch. Bruneau, which reveals the great interest which these Walloon studies may have for the historian and the Germanist, as well as for the Latin-Romanist: "La Wallonie aurait fait partie, avant les invasions germaniques, d'un groupe de populations qui avait développé une civilisation spéciale, et possédait un vocabulaire spécial, dont nous retrouvons les vestiges non seulement dans les patois romans, mais aussi dans les patois germaniques de la rive gauche du Rhin. Il serait intéressant de délimiter cette ancienne province de la Romania" (see *Romania*, LI, 441, and *Zeits. f. roman. Phil.*, XXXVIII, 1-75).

It is probable that the French element in English also owes something to the folk-speech of the Walloon region, but little seems to have been done with the needed thoroughness. Do forms like *oile*, 'oil,' *annoy*, *provost*, and Chaucer's *werreye* (for Fr. *guerreie*) reproduce Walloon characteristics? In vocabulary also it is a priori probable that English owes some material to the eastern regions of Belgium. On page 257 of J. Haust's *Etymologies* is treated the verb *trep'ser*, 'donnerà une terre le troisième labour,' representing Lat. \*TRA(N)SVERSARE (REW, 8859); similarly Fr. *traversin* is in Walloon *trep'sin*, *clavecin* is *clap'cin*, while *Stapsoul* was formerly *Stavesoul*. Cf. from the same source Engadine *trafscher*, 'verwandeln,' and also, for the meaning, Span. *travesar*, 'hin und her laufen.' Have we here the original of Eng. *trapes*, *traipse*, the origin of which has so long been doubtful? Certainly 'to tramp across fields,' now to plow, now to spread manure, then to plow or harrow it in, these suggest very closely the essential idea conveyed by *traipse* in which often there is a connotation of bedraggled and muddy weariness.—T. A. J.

The Hispanic Society of America has rendered a real service to Hispanists by printing a photographic reproduction of the 1611 edition of Covarrubias' *Tesoro de la lengua castellana*, and distributing the same gratis among its members. This famous dictionary, as everybody knows, is indispensable to the student of the Age of Gold, and, while most university libraries possess a

copy, that is far from sufficient. Each worker should have one in his private library, and while the work is not excessively rare or highly priced, it is becoming increasingly difficult to purchase. In the present edition each page is reduced to the size of a postage stamp. Along with it comes one of Admiral Fiske's reading machines. When one of the minute pages is properly placed in the holder it can be easily read through the lens. But the difficulty of operation where, as in the case of a dictionary, one desires to skip rapidly from page to page, is extreme. One hesitates to look a gift-horse in the mouth, but as the donor solicits a frank opinion one may express regret that a full-size reproduction has not been made. Many of us would gladly pay ten dollars for such a book, and the cost could be little if any more than that of the present edition. However, the main thing has been accomplished, and for this we are grateful.—G. T. N.

*Die deutsche Sprachwissenschaft in der Allgemeinen Deutschen Bibliothek. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Philologie im Zeitalter der Aufklärung.* In this inaugural dissertation, by Werner Salow (Greifswald, 1926), the somewhat dreary tale of the linguistics contained in the book-reviews of Friedrich Nicolai's journal (1766-94) is relieved by a list of the comments on doubtful words (pp. 54-107); on the whole, these are in line with the later development. The *Bibliothek* was an organ of the rationalistic movement, which here appears not so black as it has been painted; the linguistic notions are in advance of those now entertained, say, by the average teacher. The literary man is at his worst when he discusses language; in the eighteenth century he had, at any rate, good excuse for the attempt.—L. B.

Camillo von Klenze, in his *From Goethe to Hauptmann. Studies in a Changing Culture* (New York, 1926), bids farewell to active academic work in this country, and leaves with us a token of his long and successful career as a scholar and a teacher. The five essays contained in this readable book cover different periods of time and a variety of subjects, all interesting: "Goethe's Italy"; "German Predecessors of Ruskin"; "Realism and Romanticism in Keller and Meyer"; "Naturalism in German Drama from Schiller to Hauptmann"; and "Hauptmann's Treatment of the Lower Classes." The most important of these chapters seems to be the first, which is based on an investigation published some years ago. By a thorough examination of books on travel and art in Italy known to Goethe at the time of his Italian journey, von Klenze shows conclusively that Goethe's judgments of Italian art reveal no appreciable degree of originality or of spontaneity; that they follow the generally shallow and banal estimates characteristic of the rationalism of the age; that he passed by, unheeding, the art of the Florentine and the Venetian schools to worship at the conventional shrines of Bolognese and Umbrian art, especially that of Raphael.

The reviewer is inclined to attribute to this conclusion a greater impor-

tance than the author seems to do. Von Klenze turns from the artistic failure of Goethe's "Journey" to prove that that failure did not impair the importance of the "Journey" as a record of the development and expansion of his general humanistic and scientific understanding of life, and particularly of man in the totality of nature. The author, I believe, might have turned a fresher page by extending his study to Goethe's theories on art subsequent to the Italian journey, and particularly to the *Propyläen*, Goethe's art magazine, by which he attempted, fortunately in vain, to stem the tide released by a humble little work of young Wackenroder. Goethe's mentor in matters in art after 1795 was Heinrich Meyer, a copious writer who has come to be known in the history of art as the leader of the most reactionary and unintelligent academism in the art criticism of that time and well into the nineteenth century. Meyer, like Goethe in the *Propyläen*, was convinced of the mandatory or regulative force of his theories on art. Goethe and he meant to prescribe eternal rules to the artists, and to lay in bonds the spirit of Wackenroder which to them seemed revolutionary.

The technique applied by von Klenze with such success to the question of Goethe's originality in art matters during the Italian journey, namely, the technique of a comprehensive study of the artistic environment as embodied in the pictorial theory of the time, would lead to a definitive conclusion regarding the value of Goethe's pictorial theories as a whole—a conclusion, in view of current palpable exaggerations of Goethe's pictorial gifts, much to be desired. The reviewer cannot but hope that von Klenze may turn his skill in this, his own technique, to a task which would be the real completion of his investigation.

All the essays in this book are characterized by a large background of culture and well-chosen reading, and by a trained capacity to see individual works and personalities in a wide focus of ideas in process of development.—  
MARTIN SCHÜTZE.

The cataloguing of traditional materials in the field of storiology is a laborious task which has been avoided by most scholars. At the present moment, however, a number of lists are on the point of appearing. The first of these to issue from the press is P. Voorhoeve's *Overzicht van de volksverhalen der Bataks* (dissertation, Leiden, 1927). The narratives told by this tribe are in general widely current in the Far East; no doubt the material catalogued represents fairly enough the Malaysian stock of tales. The great differences between the Malaysian and the European tales made it impracticable to employ the usual system of classification, that of Antti Aarne, which is based on the ordinary North European stock. Since many Batak tales have made their way to Europe (no doubt from India as a starting-point), references to Aarne's list might have been provided in a separate list as a supplement. Scholars will thank Dr. Voorhoeve for making access possible to this large and interesting collection of material.—A. T.

In *Ethnographie sismique et volcanique, ou les tremblements de terre et les volcans dans la religion, la morale, la mythologie et le folklore de tous les peuples* (Pp. vii+206. Paris: Champion) the Count de Montessus de Ballore, former director of the seismological service in Chile, has undertaken a well-nigh impossible task, but one for which, as compiler of a *Bibliografía general de temblores y terremotos* (Santiago, 1915-19) in eight volumes, he was perhaps as well prepared as anyone. Suspicion, however, is awakened by the fact that there is but one reference to Germany, and this is taken from a Latin work. Doubt is increased by casual review of the footnotes: German or Germanic sources are conspicuously, although not completely, absent. Suspicion is confirmed by the treatment of Loki (miscalled "Loti") in Scandinavian myth. The author cites as authorities "Les Eddas" and Collin de Plancy, *Dictionnaire infernal*. It is scarcely conceivable that he verified the first of these references, and the second is hardly an authority on Norse myth. Moreover, the omission of all mention of Axel Olrik's extensive studies on Ragnarök, which are so intimately concerned with the seismological aspects, is a fault of greater import. The book is perhaps better than these criticisms make it appear. It should make no pretension to competence in matters touching Germanic tradition and folk-lore. If it announced itself rather as a preliminary collection of seismological myth, story, and superstition from chiefly French, Spanish, and Spanish-American sources, and if it had a less grandiloquent and inclusive title, it would be wholly welcome. It is conveniently arranged, it contains a useful assembling of inaccessible materials, and it is in the main carefully annotated.—A. T.

William F. Giese's *Victor Hugo. The Man and the Poet* (New York: Dial Press, 1926. Pp. 315) is the most brilliant and thorough indictment of Hugo in the English language. Proceeding on the paths trodden by Biré and Hennequin, this book says superbly nearly everything that could be said against "the man and the poet." A doctrinaire bias is evident. The author is fundamentally classical, "humanistic," rational; Joubert and Babbitt are his masters. By such measuring-rods he finds Hugo naturalistic, lawless, and lacking in taste. Romanticism in general is condemned in a dozen passages, and its high-priest is simply a "charlatan of genius."

Only that and nothing more. Professor Giese deliberately averts his eyes from this unsurpassed poetry. Although he is too wise to deny Hugo his evident gifts—verbal artistry, imagery, vision, mythopoëic fertility, descriptive mastery—these are conceded and not emphasized: it is mostly "illegitimate magic" that Hugo practices. These gifts were to a large extent vitiated by a Gothic lack of restraint together with an inability to think clearly and finely. The personal equation is, for Professor Giese, the ultimate quality that decides the integrity of the work; and Hugo's personal equation was low. This is demonstrated at some length as regards his overweening vanity, his love affairs, his political rôles, his inbred demagoguery. His humanitarian-

ism is suspect, while his conception of Nature is very inadequate. The critic summarizes the poet as:

A great decorative artist, impervious to thought and only superficially stirred by feeling, resolutely gilding commonplaces or translating man and nature into strangely arbitrary but imposing fantasies and pictures—that is perhaps a complete definition of Victor Hugo.

In other words, Hugo was not a Wordsworth, nor was he a Virgil. Professor Giese's quarrel, and that of his school, is really with French conceptions of literary art. He wants it always to be something else—thought, or ethics, or a preordained assimilation of man and nature. It is a Procrustean measure, transported from New England. It is not the way to reckon with fresh beauty and vitality. *Le plus beau poète au monde ne peut donner que ce qu'il a*. Consequently, this work, while containing many incidental values of phrase and thought, suffers from the disadvantages of a *parti pris*; it re-treads the old minuet, it repeats the familiar logical pattern. Were it not better, as regards Rousseau and Hugo, Anatole France and Marcel Proust, to subordinate other considerations and expatiate on what these writers have contributed to the art of writing? Or, if one prefers La Fontaine to Hugo, as Professor Giese does, why not "go in" for La Fontaine? Chateaubriand once suggested substituting "for the sterile criticism of defects the more fruitful criticism of beauties." Only thus can we keep our eyes level with new horizons.—E. P. D.

In *Thomas Hardy from Serial to Novel*, by Mary Ellen Chase (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1927), three of Hardy's novels, *The Mayor of Casterbridge*, *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*, and *Jude the Obscure* are the subjects of study. The main purpose is to bring out the differences in the book and the serial form of publication. At the instigation of magazine editors or out of deference to Victorian prudery and sentimentality, Hardy, in the serial publication of these novels, was less frank and realistic in the depiction of sex relationships, less somber and more sentimental in tone, and more concerned with conventional melodramatic situation and suspense. The detailed study of the differences throws an interesting light upon the conventional standards of the time and upon Hardy's methods of work.

The author in no sense condemns the novelist for his conforming to magazine requirements but commends the artistry of the final form of his work. Hardy she considers the foremost English realist of the nineteenth century. To some readers the study will justify a rather different conclusion. Hardy's chief defect, like that of other Victorian novelists, is overplotting. His concern with the minute accidents of life, his elaborate weaving of these into a fateful plot, surely qualifies the author's statement that his novels illustrate the progress of the novel from reliance upon incident to reliance upon character. Where Hardy's novels fail is precisely in the determination of the character's fates not by inner forces but by accident, coincidence, and chance.—CARL H. GRABO.



## DOCUMENTS AND RECORDS

### CHAUCEUR ABROAD IN 1368

According to the *Life Records*, Chaucer first went abroad about June 20, 1370;<sup>1</sup> but the following document, recently discovered by Mr. V. B. Redstone, shows that he was abroad in 1368:

Soient faitz briefs desouz nostre grant seal pur nostre ame vallet Geffrey Chaucer de passer en port de Douorr' ouesqez deux hakeneyz vint soldz por ses despenses et dis liures en eschange. Donne souz nostre priue seal a Wyndesore le xvij iour de Juyl Lan quarante second.<sup>2</sup>

Since there is no reference to the King's business and none to companions—not even to a servant as riding the second hackney—the probability seems to be that Chaucer went alone, with a spare horse, either on business of his own or on business not sufficiently official to be recorded as such.

The only other letters of protection of the same date which have been preserved are: (1) for four pilgrims to St. James (of Compostella) "oue quatre liures par eschange et chescun de eux oue vint soldz pur ses despenses";<sup>3</sup> and (2) for "Henri le Fauconer du Conte de Saint Poul," with one hackney which he had brought with him into the realm and with a "vallet" and his falcons, "vint soldz en monoie pur ses despenses et quarante soldz par eschange."<sup>4</sup>

These documents show clearly that Chaucer was not going with the pilgrims to Compostella, who had only four pounds among them for exchange, nor with the falconer, evidently returning to France with two pounds.

Where was Chaucer going? And how long did he remain?

According to the *Life Records*,<sup>5</sup> a half-yearly payment of his annuity was made October 31, 1368, seemingly to himself; but there is nothing else to suggest that he was in England before that time. He could, therefore, have remained abroad some three and a half months.

Of his possible destination the amount of money he carried may give some hint. It was a large sum for a man traveling alone, whether viewed as the equivalent of about fifteen hundred dollars today or in comparison with the amounts carried by other travelers, as appears from the following list:

G. de Dene, yeoman, Dover to Rome, two hackneys, £10, Nov. 17, 1367.<sup>6</sup>

J. Busevill, parson, Dover to Rome, one hackney, £10, Dec., 1367.<sup>7</sup>

Two monks, Dover to Rome, one yeoman and three hackneys, £10, Dec., 1367.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> IV, 180. He went on the King's business but the circumstances of his journey and his destination are still unknown.

<sup>2</sup> Chancery Warrants, Bills and Privy Seal, C. 81/918, No. 16.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 15.

<sup>4</sup> IV, 161.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 73.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 17.

<sup>7</sup> Cal. Pat. Rolls (1367-70), p. 70.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*



John de Padebury, squire, with two men and three horses, Dover to Naples, £15, Jan. 15—July 16, 1346-47.<sup>1</sup> This last is especially illuminating because Padebury was of Chaucer's status, he was evidently alone, and the fifteen pounds clearly included his expenses to Naples, both ways.

More interesting still is the detailed account of Edmund Rose, whose name also appears near Chaucer's in the list of squires, who went to Pavia with seventeen horses and seven greyhounds for the Duke of Milan, January 27—March 20, 1368, shortly before Lionel set out to marry the Duke of Milan's daughter. Although Rose's account is interesting enough to publish in some detail, the main points of it will suffice here. He was given eighty pounds at the exchequer; he had eighteen men; he was rather more than seven weeks on the way; his slowness is to be explained partly by the season and partly by his incumbrances, two weeks being given to resting, sometimes several days at a time, and dosing the horses. He spent altogether £99 10s. 7d.; but as a study of his accounts shows, nearly £30 went for extras which would be little or nothing in the case of a single traveler.<sup>2</sup> With these deductions, it is safe to say that £5 each way would have covered the expenses of one man going to Pavia with two horses.<sup>3</sup> An interesting check on this is the allowance made for the expenses of the messenger sent by Rose to England on March 24, four days after his arrival. This messenger was forty-five days (March 24—May 7) on the return journey and was allowed 16d. a day for himself and his horse—a total of £3.<sup>4</sup> Compare with this Chaucer's item in 1373 for the expenses of three messengers sent to England from either Florence or Genoa as £7 10s., or 50s. each.<sup>5</sup> But nearer to Chaucer's case is that of John de Burton, "vallet" of the Queen, who only a short time before, May 1, 1368, went overseas via Dover, with two "garçons" and two hackneys, to Lombardy with ten marks "en eschange."<sup>6</sup> All this goes to show that Chaucer could have gone out to his earliest patron, Prince Lionel, and have returned to England on the sum he is known to have had.

But since the search for information has not been completed, it need not be argued now that he did go to Italy, though the likelihood of this destination, in view of all the circumstances, is much greater than that of Gascony, Prussia, or Spain. Apart from its possible implications, the new item is sufficiently interesting as showing the young poet, apparently alone on the Continent, two years before his earliest recorded mission abroad.

EDITH RICKERT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

<sup>1</sup> K. R. Accounts, E 101/312/25.

<sup>2</sup> As, for instance, for the pay of a French man-at-arms, to guide the party and give safe-conduct (no doubt the palfreys and hounds were valuable), for ferries, medicine for the horses, farriery, and so on, as well as for the expenses of a messenger sent back to England.

<sup>3</sup> Rose allowed 18d. per man and horse, *per diem*.

<sup>4</sup> Cut by the auditor to 52s.

<sup>5</sup> LR, IV, 184.

<sup>6</sup> C.81/916, No. 1. Note also in the same file that William de Hodyngne and John Courtepy (position not stated) went overseas to the Duke of Clarence, with two "garçons," taking only £26 (*ibid.*, No. 22).





205  
M6

English

Each Dept. 2.00

VOLUME XXV

ENGLISH SEMINAR

NUMBER 4

May 1928

LIBRARY OF THE

JUN 16 1928

# MODERN PHILOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

*A Journal devoted to research in  
Modern Languages and Literatures*

THE UNIVERSITY of CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

The Cambridge University Press, London; The Maruzen Company, Limited, Tokyo;  
The Commercial Press, Limited, Shanghai

# MODERN PHILOLOGY

A JOURNAL DEVOTED TO RESEARCH IN  
MODERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

## Editors

JOHN M. MANLY, *General Editor*  
WILLIAM A. NITEL, *Managing Editor*  
TOM PENTE CROSS, *Publishing Editor*

CHARLES R. BASKERVILLE  
GEORGE T. NORTUP  
T. ATKINSON JENKINS  
RONALD S. CRANE

JAMES R. HULBERT  
GEORGE W. SHERRURN  
E. PRESTON DARGAN

PHILIP S. ALLEN  
ARCHER TAYLOR  
WILLIAM A. CRAIGIE

## Advisory Board

STARR W. CUTTING  
JEFFERSON B. FLETCHER  
GEORGE L. KITTINGER  
ERNEST H. WILKINS

FREDERICK M. WARREN  
FRANCIS A. WOOD  
KARL PIETZCH

VOL. XXV

CONTENTS FOR MAY 1928

No. 4

The Origin of the Dialectal Differences in Spoken American English	Hans Kurath	385
Alliteration in the Runic Inscriptions	Francis Owen	397
Dryden versus Settle	Roswell G. Ham	409
Dryden, Hobbes, and the Royal Society	Louis I. Bredvold	417
Thomson and the Countess of Hertford	Helen Sarà Hughes	439
The Role of Gulliver	John Brooks Moore	469
Precursors of the Finnish Method of Folk-Lore Study	Archer Taylor	481
Reviews		493
Briefer Mention		508
Documents and Records		511

*Modern Philology* is published quarterly by the University of Chicago at the University Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (The subscription price is \$4.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.00. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Dominican Republic, Canary Islands, El Salvador, Argentina, Bolivia, Brasil, Colombia, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Haiti, Uruguay, Paraguay, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoa Islands, Balearic Islands, and Spain. Postage is charged extra as follows: for Canada and Newfoundland, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.15), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.04); for all other countries in the Postal Union, 25 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.25), on single copies 6 cents (total \$1.06). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to The University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized to quote the prices indicated:

For the British Empire: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4, England. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, £1 1s. 6d. each; single copies, including postage, 5s. 3d. each.

For China: THE COMMERCIAL PRESS, LTD., Pao-shan Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions, \$4.00; single copies, \$1.00, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra on yearly subscriptions 25 cents, on single copies 6 cents. Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts should be addressed to The Managing Editor of MODERN PHILOLOGY, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Entered as second-class matter July 12, 1903, at the Post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 15, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

[illegible]







HOW TO STUDY MODERN  
LANGUAGES IN COL-  
LEGE. By PETER HAGBOLDT.  
25 cents, postpaid 27 cents.

Mr. Hagboldt outlines a definite technique of studying modern languages, and offers hints and psychological principles that will inevitably improve study methods. This convenient manual discusses aims and methods of modern language study; inhibitions and fundamental principles; and gives rules for studying grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, reading, and translation.

HOW TO STUDY MODERN  
LANGUAGES IN HIGH  
SCHOOL. By PETER HAG-  
BOLDT. 25 cents, postpaid 27  
cents.

What his earlier manual does for the college student, this one does for the less mature beginner in modern languages. It takes up in turn every practical question that must occur to the young student; the personal aim and the class method, common obstacles and their remedies, fundamental principles of learning, pronunciation, extensive reading, vocabulary, translation, grammar, and speaking.

THE UNIVERSITY OF  
CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO . . . ILLINOIS

# *The* MODERN PHILOLOGY MONOGRAPHS

*of the*  
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*Editorial Committee*

PHILIP S. ALLEN      JOHN M. MANLY  
WILLIAM A. NITZE  
TOM PEETE CROSS, *Chairman*

SPANISH GRAIL FRAGMENTS. Vols. I and II. By  
KARL PIETSCH

Vol. I contains the Spanish text, with introductory and supplementary chapters.

Vol. II contains the most extensive commentary that has yet been published on a single Old Spanish text. \$5.00

THE LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE OF LODOWICK  
BRYSKETT. By HENRY R. PLOMER and TOM  
PEETE CROSS.

This is a valuable compilation and contains source material otherwise accessible only in the British Public Record Office and in other collections of archives. The evidence presented throws light upon an important period of English history and upon the life of the poet Spenser. \$2.00

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO MANUSCRIPT OF THE  
*Genealogia Deorum Gentilium* OF BOCCACCIO.  
By ERNEST H. WILKINS.

The descriptive material has been prepared with great care not only to do justice to the Chicago manuscript but to illustrate the processes of the preparation, the writing, and the decoration of manuscripts in general. \$3.00

MILTON PAPERS. By DAVID H. STEVENS.

The first papers and the Appendix of this book present the only deeds to property owned by the Milton family that have been found thus far, and this study adds important details. There are also fresh studies of materials long since known to Milton scholars but never studied intensively. \$2.00

---

THE UNIVERSITY OF  
CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO . . . ILLINOIS

# *New Essays* *by Oliver* *Goldsmith*

*Edited by*  
RONALD S. CRANE

Here is a Goldsmith first edition. Eighteen essays, printed anonymously in various periodicals of the eighteenth century, have been discovered and identified by Professor Ronald S. Crane as authentic Goldsmith material. They are published now for the first time under Goldsmith's name and together constitute the largest single addition to the canon of Goldsmith's essays that has been made for more than a century.

A complete *Deserted Village* in prose is notable among them. Under the title "The Revolution in Low Life," it antedated the publication of the famous poem by eight years.

"Professor Crane's salvaging of eighteen hitherto unknown essays is a major event in literary publication."—*Chicago Daily News*.

*First printing limited to 200 copies,  
printed on all-rag paper and bound  
in leather, \$10.00*

*Second printing bound in cloth, \$3.00*

---

THE UNIVERSITY OF  
CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO . . . ILLINOIS

# An Introduction to Spanish Literature

*By*  
GEORGE T. NORTHUP

Mr. Northup opens for the student and general reader the world of Spanish literature—the realm of picaresque romance, Cervantes, Lope de Vega, and the Cid. In this single volume is presented a picture of Spanish literature as a whole from its beginning in epic and drama to the present generation of writers. Mr. Northup's style is at once clear and systematic and full of color; here is a well-written history of Spanish letters; a book about literature that is itself a work of distinction and charm.

Facts about the authors' lives helpful in understanding their works are woven into the discussion. Plots of novels, bits of poetry and story, critical comment carry the reader along and introduce him to one of the world's great literatures. In the final chapter the reader is introduced to the writers of today—Benavente, Pío Baroja, Valle-Inclán, and others—in a biographical-critical discussion.

*\$3.00, postpaid, \$3.15*

THE UNIVERSITY OF  
CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO . . . ILLINOIS

## Cambridge University Press

---

**The Later Court Hands in England.** By HILARY JENKINSON. With 44 colotype plates. 4to. \$18.00.

**A History of Late 18th Century Drama 1750 to 1800.** By A. NICOLL. Demy 8vo. \$6.50.

**The Court Masque.** A Study in the Relationship between Poetry and the Revels. By ENID WELSFORD. With 12 plates. Demy 8vo. \$10.00.

**God, Man, and Epic Poetry.** By H. V. ROUTH, M.A. A Study of Comparative Literature. Demy 8vo. 2 Vols. \$4.00 each.

**The Place-Names of Worcestershire.** By A. MAWER and F. M. STENTON. Vol. IV. With a map. Demy 8vo. \$6.50. (*English Place-Name Society's Publications.*)

**The Soul of Grammar.** By E. A. SONNENSCHN. Crown 8vo. \$2.00.

**An Early Irish Reader.** By N. KERSHAW CHADWICK. Demy 8vo. \$2.00.

**An Early Norse Reader.** By G. N. GARMONSWAY. Demy 8vo. \$3.40.

**Spanish Syntax and Composition.** By J. P. HOWARD, M.A. Crown 8vo. \$1.35.

**The Cambridge Reinaert Fragments.** Edited, with a photographic reproduction, a literal transcription, an amended text, and an introduction and a bibliography, by KARL BREUL, M.A., Litt.D., Ph.D. Fcap 4to. \$3.00. (*Culemann Fragments.*)

**Gower. Confessio Amantis.** Selections. Pott 8vo. \$0.50. (*Cambridge Plain Texts.*)

**Rules for Catalogues of Printed Books in Cambridge University Library.** Demy 8vo. \$1.60.

---

**Published by the Cambridge University Press (England)**  
**Sold by The Macmillan Company, Agents in the United States**  
**60 Fifth Avenue, New York City**

# *The* ROMANIC REVIEW

Founded by  
PROFESSOR HENRY ALFRED TODD

## A Quarterly Journal

Devoted to Research in the  
Romance Languages  
and Literatures

Edited by  
JOHN L. GERIG

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY  
NEW YORK

*Subscription price, \$4.00 per year*

## Publications of the INSTITUT DES ÉTUDES FRANÇAISES

G. L. VAN ROOSBROECK

*The Legend of the Decadents*  
\$1.50

A. H. KRAPPE

*Balor with the Evil Eye*  
*Studies in Celtic and French*  
*Literature* \$2.25

Send orders to

G. L. VAN ROOSBROECK

501 Philosophy Hall, Columbia University

New York, N.Y.

# Elementary Russian Grammar

By E. PROKOSCH

*Bryn Mawr College*

The results of twenty years' experience in the teaching of foreign languages are embodied in this book. It employs the essential features of what is commonly known as the "direct method." To this end it analyzes Russian pronunciation on a phonetic basis, simplifies the traditional grammar, and makes an oral approach to an elementary vocabulary through object teaching. The book aims at a consciously correct pronunciation, an intuitive feeling for grammatical structure, and an ability to read Russian without the crutch of translation.

*\$2.25, postpaid \$2.35*

The University of Chicago Press

Chicago, Illinois





# FLAUBERT'S YOUTH

## 1821-1845

By LEWIS PIAGET SHANKS

Associate Professor in the Johns Hopkins University

264 pages · 12 mo. · Cloth · \$2.25

YOUNG Flaubert's infatuation with the dreams of Romanticism, and his vain search for them in life and love, are here traced through his letters and juvenilia by the author of a biography of Anatole France. A detailed portrait of Flaubert, indispensable to readers who seek the novelist in his mature works, and completed by a final chapter sketching his career after his twenty-fourth year. The book contains the first account in English of Flaubert's earliest novel, in which he rejects Romanticism and outlines his theories of Art. Contents: I. Boyhood and First Love; II. Adolescence; III. The Adolescent Pessimist; IV. First Travels; V. *Novembre*; VI. Nervous Breakdown; VII. *First Education Sentimentale*; VIII. Flaubert at Twenty-Three; Epilogue.

An excellent volume. In its pages we meet the man Flaubert. *Quarterly Review, England.*

A full and heavily documented account of Flaubert's youth. *American Mercury.*

A very solid piece of research. *Boston Transcript.*

A colourful and most interesting narrative. *Cornell Alumni News.*

Mr. Shanks' study in itself purports to cover only the years from 1821 to 1845. But the brief epilogue is rich in illustration. *New York Sun.*

A useful and scholarly work. Through the letters and early works of Flaubert, Mr. Shanks traces the evolution of the wild romanticist, showing how his youthful temperament satisfied itself in "Salamambo," and how the author attained to the serenity and ironic detachment which enabled him to pillory his own romantic weaknesses in the person of Emma Bovary, and to satirize his adolescent ambitions and enthusiasm in "Bouvard and Pécuchet." *Independent.*

In this very excellent analysis of the life and works of this gifted nineteenth century writer, Professor Shanks has struck the high note of the influence of the early years, childhood and adolescence on the mature works of a genius. The book guides the reader's mind through the five octaves, so to speak, until it reveals a clear insight into the mind and character of Flaubert. *Washington Post.*

Mr. Shanks has discerned the importance of these early works of Flaubert, and, in a valuable essay, has convincingly traced the development of Flaubert's sensibility from boyhood to the writing of the first "L'Education sentimentale." *London Times Literary Supplement.*

His student life, his travels, his early writings, and the fermentation of his vague but fierce desires are described in a way that throws light on the youth of that generation. *London Quarterly Review.*

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

BALTIMORE

MARYLAND



# NEW FRENCH TEXTS

## FRENCH LITERATURE IN OUTLINE

By Philip H. Churchman, Ph.D., Clark University, and Charles E. Young, Ph.D., State University of Iowa. A conveniently arranged handbook presenting chronologically by periods all the more important facts relative to the history of French literature. Adapted to the needs of classes that are covering the subject in a hasty fashion as well as of classes that have the time to devote to a more detailed study. 12mo, 322 pages. \$1.60.

### PREMIÈRE ANNÉE DE FRANÇAIS DE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

It is believed that this is the first book to fill adequately the needs of the first-year course in French in Junior High Schools. It has been prepared by Leopold Cardon, Professor of French, Temple University, and Alice Cardon of the Brearley School, New York, two experienced teachers. Excepting for the introduction, the book is written entirely in French. It teaches the elements of pronunciation, the essentials of grammar, and a useful vocabulary. Contains a great many interesting drawings to illustrate various points in grammar, words, and the reading texts. A simple, practical, and appealing book for young people who are just beginning a study of French. *To be published early in the summer.*

### SELECTIONS FROM THÉOPHILE GAUTIER

Four short stories, eight poems, and a chapter from *Histoire du Romantisme*, edited with introduction, notes, and vocabulary by Aaron Schaffer, Ph.D., University of Texas, and S. A. Rhodes, Ph.D., Rice Institute. Intended for second-year courses in French. 12mo, 107 + 78 pages. *Four illustrations and a map.* Price, \$1.10.

### CHRISTOPHE COLOMB

Népomucène Lemerrier's historical comedy, important in the history of French drama as a forerunner of the romantic plays of Dumas père, Hugo, et al, edited for second- and third-year courses in French by Charles Grimm, Ph.D., Williams College. Supplemented by an introduction, notes, bibliography, and vocabulary. 12mo, 77 + 37 pages, *illustrated.* Probable price, 60 cents.

353 Fourth Ave.  
New York

THE CENTURY CO.

2126 Prairie Ave.  
Chicago

